arXiv:1702.07100v1 [math-ph] 23 Feb 2017

Matrix product ensembles of Hermite-type

P. J. Forrester*, J. R. Ipsen†

ARC Centre of Excellence for Mathematical and Statistical Frontiers, School of Mathematics and Statistics, The University of Melbourne, Victoria 3010, Australia.

Dang-Zheng Liu‡

Key Laboratory of Wu Wen-Tsun Mathematics, CAS, School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, P.R. China

Current address: Institute of Science and Technology Austria, Klosterneuburg 3400, Austria

Abstract

We investigate spectral properties of a Hermitised random matrix product which, contrary to previous product ensembles, allows for eigenvalues on the full real line. We find an explicit expression of the joint probability density function as a bi-orthogonal ensemble and it is shown that this ensemble reduces asymptotically to the Hermite Muttalib–Borodin model. Explicit expression for the bi-orthogonal functions as well as the correlation kernel are provided. Moreover, we find the explicit functional form of the local correlations near the origin (hard edge) and the global scaling limit of the spectrum. Both are compared with known results for the Hermite Muttalib–Borodin model. As a part of this study, we introduce a new matrix transformation which maps the space of polynomial ensembles onto itself.

1 Introduction

1.1 Statement of the problem and summary of results

Let H be a matrix from the Gaussian unitary ensemble (GUE) and let each G_i $(i = 1, \dots, M)$ denote a complex Ginibre matrix, i.e. a matrix with i.i.d. standard complex Gaussian entries. In this paper, we investigate the eigenvalues of the Hermitised product matrix

$$W_M = G_M^\dagger \cdots G_1^\dagger H G_1 \cdots G_M \tag{1.1}$$

under the assumption that all matrices, H and G_i $(i = 1, \dots, M)$, are independent. We will see that the eigenvalues form a bi-orthogonal ensemble [9]. Furthermore, this ensemble is closely related (in a sense that will be specified in the next subsection) to the so-called Hermite Muttalib–Borodin model [9, 42]. The latter is defined by the joint eigenvalue probability density function (PDF)

$$\tilde{P}(x_1, \dots, x_N) = \frac{1}{\tilde{Z}_N^{(M)}} \prod_{1 \le j < k \le N} (x_k - x_j)(x_k^{2M+1} - x_j^{2M+1}) \prod_{\ell=1}^N |x_\ell|^\alpha e^{-x_\ell^2}, \tag{1.2}$$

where $\tilde{Z}_N^{(M)}$ is a normalisation constant and α is a non-negative constant.

It will transpire that the bi-orthogonal ensemble structure associated with the eigenvalue PDF of the product matrix (1.1) is a corollary of the following more basic result.

*pjforr@unimelb.edu.au
†jesper.ipsen@unimelb.edu.au
‡dzliu@ustc.educ.cn

Theorem 1. *Let G be an $n \times N$ $(n \leq N)$ standard complex Gaussian matrix and let A be an $n \times n$ Hermitian matrix which (without loss of generality) may be taken to be diagonal $A = \operatorname{diag}(a_1, \ldots, a_N)$. If the eigenvalues of A are pairwise distinct and ordered as*

$$a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a_{n_0} < 0 < a_{n_0+1} < \cdots < a_n, \tag{1.3}$$

then the PDF of the non-zero eigenvalues of matrix $X = G^\dagger A G$ is given by

$$P_n^{n_0}(\{a_j\}_{j=1}^n; \{x_j\}_{j=1}^n) = \prod_{l=1}^n \frac{1}{|a_l|} \frac{(x_l/a_l)^{N-n}}{(N-l)!} \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq n} \frac{x_k - x_j}{a_k - a_j} \det\left[e^{-x_i/a_j}\right]_{i,j=1}^{n_0} \det\left[e^{-x_i/a_j}\right]_{i,j=n_0+1}^{n}, \tag{1.4}$$

where

$$x_1 < \cdots < x_{n_0} < 0 < x_{n_0+1} < \cdots < x_n. \tag{1.5}$$

In particular, we see that X has n_0 $(n - n_0)$ negative (positive) eigenvalues, i.e. the same number as A. The remaining $N - n$ eigenvalues are all identical to zero.

The rest of this paper is organised as follows: In Section 2, we use Theorem 1 to find the PDF for the eigenvalues of the product (1.1) as a bi-orthogonal ensemble. Moreover, the explicit expression for the PDF is seen to reduce asymptotically to the functional form (1.2) specifying the Hermite Muttalib–Borodin model. Explicit expressions for the bi-orthogonal functions are derived in Section 3. Analogous to the Hermite polynomials, we will see that it is convenient to consider bi-orthogonal functions of even and odd degree separately. Section 4 provides reformulations of the bi-orthogonal functions and the correlation kernel as integral representations, which are more suited for asymptotic analysis. These integral representations can also be expressed in terms of Meijer G-functions, and we will see that they are closely related to known formulae stemming from the product ensemble of Laguerre-type. The local scaling limit at the origin is derived and seen to be related to the Meijer G-kernel in Section 5. This result is also compared with local scaling limit of the Hermite Muttalib–Borodin model. Section 6 includes derivations of the global spectrum of the product (1.1) as well as the Hermite Muttalib–Borodin models. Since our product ensemble reduces asymptotically to the Hermite Muttalib–Borodin models, they are (unsurprisingly) seen to have the same global spectrum, which in turn is given in terms of the Fuss–Catalan density. Finally, Theorem 1 is proven in the appendix. This theorem is an important result by itself. For this reason, we provide three separate proofs each with their own merits.

1.2 Motivation

Orthogonal ensembles are point processes on (a subset of) the real line with a joint distribution given by

$$P(dx_1, \ldots, dx_n) = \frac{1}{Z_n} \Delta_n(\{x\})^2 \prod_{k=1}^n w(x_k) dx_k, \tag{1.6}$$

where Z_N is a normalisation constant, $w(x)$ is a non-negative weight function, and $\Delta_n(\{x\})$ denotes the Vandermonde determinant,

$$\Delta(\{x\}) = \det_{1 \leq i,j \leq n}\left[x_i^{j-1}\right] = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (x_j - x_i). \tag{1.7}$$

Like the corresponding moment problem, it is often useful to distinguish between models with support on a finite, semi-infinite, and double-infinite interval. The canonical examples are the

Jacobi-, Laguerre-, and Hermite-ensembles summarised in Table 1. These ensembles are named according to the corresponding classical orthogonal polynomials. In fact, for $a \neq 0$ the latter would more appropriately be called the generalised Hermite ensemble.

Table 1: Summary of weight functions and support for the three canonical orthogonal ensembles in random matrix theory given by joint distribution (1.6).

ensemble	weight	support
Laguerre	$w(\lambda) = \lambda^a e^{-\lambda}$	$\lambda \in (0, \infty)$
Jacobi	$w(\lambda) = \lambda^a (1-\lambda)^b$	$\lambda \in (0, 1)$
Hermite	$w(\lambda) = \lvert\lambda\rvert^a e^{-\lambda^2}$	$\lambda \in (-\infty, \infty)$

In random matrix theory these three ensembles play a fundamental role as they appear as the distribution of the eigenvalues (or singular values) for the transfer (or truncated unitary) ensemble, the complex Wishart (or chiral) ensemble, and the Gaussian unitary ensemble, respectively.

A fundamental insight, which can be traced back to Wigner [48], is that the joint distribution (1.6) allows an interpretation as the equilibrium measure for a one-dimensional gas of pairwise repulsive point particles in a confining potential. More precisely, consider the Gibbs measure for a classical gas of n point particles which are pairwise repulsive according to a two-point potential $U(x, y)$ and confined by a common one-point potential $V(x)$, i.e.

$$P(dx_1, \dots, dx_n) = \frac{1}{Z_n} e^{-\beta E(x_1, \dots, x_n)} \prod_{k=1}^{d} x_k \tag{1.8}$$

with β denoting the inverse temperature and E the energy functional

$$E(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{n} V(x_k) - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} U(x_j, x_i). \tag{1.9}$$

We see that at $\beta = 2$ (sometimes referred to as the free fermion point) the Gibbs measure (1.8) is identical to (1.6) provided we set $V(\lambda) = -\log w(\lambda)$ and $U(x_i, x_j) = \log |x_j - x_i|$. In this way, the eigenvalues of random matrices relate to the Boltzmann factor of a simple statistical mechanical system with one- and two-body interactions only.

A recent development in random matrix theory is the study of exactly solvable product ensembles, see [2] for a review. As an example, let G_i $(i = 1, \dots, M)$ be independent complex Ginibre matrices (matrices those entries are i.i.d. standard complex Gaussians) and consider the Hermitian product

$$G_M^\dagger \cdots G_1^\dagger G_1 \cdots G_M. \tag{1.10}$$

From the work of Akemann et al. [3, 4], we know that the explicit PDF for the eigenvalues of the matrix (1.10) is

$$P^{(M)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \frac{1}{Z_n^{(M)}} \Delta_n(\{x\}) \det_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \left[g_j^{(M)}(x_i) \right], \tag{1.11}$$

where $Z_n^{(M)}$ is a known normalisation constant and $g_j^{(M)}(x)$ $(j = 1, \dots, n)$ are given by certain Meijer G-functions. Technically, such PDFs are known as polynomial ensembles [36].

It seems natural to ask whether these product ensembles also have (at least approximately) an interpretation as a Gibbs measure of the form (1.8) and (1.9). However, unlike the Vandermonde

determinant, the determinant in (1.11) cannot be evaluated as a product (for $M \geq 2$). This prohibits a literal interpretation of the eigenvalues of (1.10) as a statistical mechanical system with only one- and two-body interactions. One could fear that this meant that there was no simple physical interpretation related to (1.11). However, if we consider (1.11) with each x_j large, the Meijer G-functions can be replaced by their asymptotic approximation [16]. After a change of variables, the joint density (1.11) to leading order in the asymptotic expansion becomes [22]

$$\tilde{P}^{(M)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \frac{1}{\tilde{Z}_n^{(M)}} \Delta_n(\{x\}) \Delta_n(\{x^M\}) \prod_{k=1}^{n} x_k^a \, e^{-x_k}, \tag{1.12}$$

where a is a known non-negative constant. This does correspond to the Boltzmann factor of a statistical mechanical system with one- and two-body interactions only.

A comparison between (1.11) and (1.12) can be done a posteriori. A connection between the two ensembles was first noted by Kuijlaars and Stivigny [36], who observed that the hard edge scaling limit of (1.12) found in [9] took the same functional form as the Meijer G-kernel found in the product ensemble [37], albeit with a different choice of parameters. Due to recent progress even more is known about the scaling limits of both models. Thus it has been established that the two ensembles also share the same global spectral distribution [8, 11, 24, 41, 45]. Furthermore, in the both cases the local correlations in the bulk and near the soft edge are given by the familiar sine and Airy process, respectively [39, 49].

The ensemble (1.11) has, in fact, appeared earlier in the literature. It was first isolated by Muttalib [42], who suggested it as a naive approximation to the transmission eigenvalues in a problem about quantum transport. A feature of the new interaction is that bi-orthogonal polynomials (rather than orthogonal polynomials) are needed in the study of correlation functions. Such bi-orthogonal ensembles were considered in greater generality by Borodin [9], who devoted special interest to PDFs

$$P(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \frac{1}{Z_n(M)} \prod_{j=1}^{n} w(x_l) \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq n} |x_k - x_j| \, \big| \operatorname{sgn}(x_k)|x_k|^\theta - \operatorname{sgn}(x_j)|x_j|^\theta \big|, \tag{1.13}$$

with $\theta > 0$ and $w(x)$ representing one of the three classical weight functions from Table 1. Following [24], we will henceforth refer to these ensembles as the (Laguerre, Jacobi, Hermite) Muttalib–Borodin models. We note that the awkward dependence of signs in the last factor in (1.13) disappears when the eigenvalues are non-negative (e.g. for Laguerre- and Jacobi-ensembles) and when θ is an odd integer as in (1.2).

At the time of their introduction, the Muttalib–Borodin models had no obvious relation to any random matrix models (except for the trivial case $\theta = 1$), and could merely be understood as a simple one-parameter generalisation of the classical ensembles. However, we now see that the Laguerre Muttalib–Borodin model has a close connection to products of complex Gaussian random matrices (1.10) through the approximation (1.12).

Knowing that the Laguerre Muttalib–Borodin model appears as an asymptotic approximation to the Gaussian product (1.10), it seems natural to ask the reverse question: *Can we find product ensembles which reduce asymptotically to the Jacobi and Hermite Muttalib–Borodin models?* If this is possible, it would be reasonable to say we have completed a link between the Muttalib–Borodin models with classical weights and the new family of product ensembles.

For the Jacobi Muttalib–Borodin model a link to products of random matrices is provided by looking at the squared singular values of a product of truncated unitary matrices [24, 32]. In this paper, it is our aim to isolate a random matrix product structure for which the eigenvalue

PDF reduces asymptotically to the functional form of the Hermite Muttalib–Borodin model. This construction therefore completes the correspondence between product ensembles and the three Muttalib–Borodin models with classical weights, i.e. Laguerre, Jacobi, Hermite. Furthermore, the relevant product ensemble provides by itself a new interesting class of integrable models, which unlike all previous product ensembles (see [2]) allows for negative eigenvalues.

As the product ensemble in question must allow for negative eigenvalues, it is no longer sufficient to investigate Wishart-type matrices like (1.10) which are positive-definite by construction. It turns out that the correct structure is the Hermitised product of a GUE matrix and M complex Ginibre matrices given by (1.1). The case $M = 1$ of (1.1) has previously been isolated in the recent paper of Kumar [38] as an example of a matrix ensemble which permits an explicit eigenvalue PDF.

2 Products of random matrices and the Hermite Muttalib–Borodin model

In this section, we establish the eigenvalue PDF of the matrix product (1.1) and show that it reduces asymptotically to the Hermite Muttalib–Borodin model (1.2).

As stated in the introduction, the eigenvalue PDF of (1.1) follows as a consequence of Theorem 1. The idea is simple: let A be a random matrix from a polynomial ensemble, i.e. it has an eigenvalue PDF of the form

$$P_A(\{a_k\}_{k=1}^n) = \frac{1}{Z_n} \prod_{1\le i<j\le n} (a_j - a_i) \det[w_j(a_i)]_{i,j=1}^n, \tag{2.1}$$

where $a_1 \le a_2 \le \cdots \le a_n$ are the (ordered) eigenvalues of A, w_j $(j = 1, \dots, n)$ is a family of weight functions, and Z_n is a normalisation constant. Now, let G be an $n \times N$ $(n \le N)$ standard complex Gaussian matrix. Then Theorem 1 gives the eigenvalue PDF of $G^\dagger A G$. Moreover, it is seen that this new eigenvalue PDF is also a polynomial ensemble. In other words, Theorem 1 provides a map from the class of polynomial ensembles into itself. Thus, we may apply Theorem 1 recursively to construct hierarchies of polynomial ensembles. Let us make this statement more precise.

Lemma 2. *Let G be an $n \times N$ $(n \le N)$ standard complex Gaussian matrix, and let A be a random matrix from a polynomial ensemble with eigenvalue PDF (2.1), independent of G. Then the PDF for the non-zero eigenvalues of the random matrix product $G^\dagger A G$ is equal to*

$$\frac{1}{Z_n} \prod_{l=1}^n \frac{1}{(N-l)!} \prod_{1\le j<k\le n} (x_k - x_j) \det_{1\le i,j\le n} \left[\int_0^\infty \frac{da\, e^{-a}}{a^{n-N+1}} w_j\Big(\frac{x_i}{a}\Big) \right] \tag{2.2}$$

with the ordered eigenvalues $x_1 \le x_2 \le \cdots \le x_n$.

Proof. In order to use Theorem 1, we fix an $n_0 \in \{0, 1, \dots, N\}$ and assume that the eigenvalues of A is ordered as (1.3). Consequently, the non-zero eigenvalues of $G^\dagger A G$ can be ordered as (1.5) almost surely. It follows from the conditional eigenvalue PDF (1.4) and (2.1) that the eigenvalue PDF of $G^\dagger A G$ (up to $N - n$ eigenvalues which are identical to zero) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_D P_A(\{a_k\}_{k=1}^n) P_n^{n_0}(\{a_j\}_{j=1}^n; \{x_j\}_{j=1}^n)\, da_1 \cdots da_n = \frac{1}{Z_n} \prod_{1\le j<k\le n} (x_k - x_j) \\ &\times \int_D \prod_{l=1}^n \frac{1}{|a_l|} \frac{(x_l/a_l)^{N-n}}{(N-l)!} \det \begin{bmatrix} \{e^{-x_i/a_j}\}_{i,j=1}^{n_0} & 0 \\ 0 & \{e^{-x_i/a_j}\}_{i,j=n_0+1}^{n} \end{bmatrix} \det[w_j(a_i)]_{i,j=1}^n\, da_1 \cdots da_n, \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

where the domain of integration D is given according to (1.3) and the eigenvalues x_i $(i = 1, \dots, n)$ are ordered according to (1.5). We note that the integral on the second line in (2.3) is a close cousin to the well-known Andreief integral [6, 10]. Upon expansion of the determinants, it is readily seen that (2.3) may rewritten as

$$\frac{1}{Z_n} \prod_{l=1}^{n} \frac{1}{(N-l)!} \prod_{1 \le j < k \le n} (x_k - x_j) \det \begin{bmatrix} \left\{ -\int_{-\infty}^{0} \frac{da}{a} (x_i/a)^{N-n} e^{-x_i/a} w_j(a) \right\}_{\substack{i=1,\dots,n_0 \\ j=1,\dots,n}} \\ \left\{ \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{da}{a} (x_i/a)^{N-n} e^{-x_i/a} w_j(a) \right\}_{\substack{i=n_0+1,\dots,n \\ j=1,\dots,n}} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{2.4}$$

If we make a change of variables $a \mapsto -a$ in the first n_0 rows in the determinant in (2.4) then we get

$$\frac{1}{Z_n} \prod_{l=1}^{n} \frac{1}{(N-l)!} \prod_{1 \le j < k \le n} (x_k - x_j) \det_{1 \le i,j \le n} \left[\int_0^{\infty} \frac{da}{a} \frac{e^{-|x_i|/a}}{(|x_i|/a)^{n-N}} w_j((\operatorname{sgn} x_i) a) \right]; \tag{2.5}$$

recall that x_i $(i = 1, \dots, n)$ is ordered according (1.5). Finally, if we make another change of variables $a \mapsto |x_i|/a$ in the i-th row, then (2.2) follows. □

Remark 3. The study of maps from the space of polynomial ensembles onto itself is an interesting endeavour, since such maps give rise to new random matrix ensembles without destroying integrability. In fact, a study of such maps is presently an active area of research in random matrix theory [13, 31, 34, 35]. Lemma 2 provides a new transformation to this class of maps, which cannot be obtained directly from any of the previously established transformations.

With Lemma 2 at hand, we are ready to write down the eigenvalue PDF for the product (1.1).

Theorem 4. *Let $\nu_0 = 0, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_M$ be non-negative integers. Suppose that H is an $n \times n$ GUE matrix and $G_1, \dots, G_M$ are independent standard complex Gaussian matrices where G_m is of size $(\nu_{m-1} + n) \times (\nu_m + n)$. Then the joint PDF for the non-zero eigenvalues of the matrix (1.1) is given by*

$$P^{(M)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \frac{1}{Z_n^{(M)}} \prod_{1 \le i < j \le n} (x_j - x_i) \det_{1 \le i,j \le n} \left[g_{j-1}^{(M)}(x_i) \right], \tag{2.6}$$

where the weight functions $g_j^{(M)}$ are defined recursively by

$$g_j^{(0)}(x) = x^j e^{-x^2} \quad \text{and} \quad g_j^{(m)}(x) = \int_0^{\infty} \frac{dy}{y} y^{\nu_m} e^{-y} g_j^{(m-1)}(x/y), \quad m = 1, \dots, M \tag{2.7}$$

and the normalisation constant is

$$Z_n^{(M)} = 2^{-n(n-1)/2} \pi^{n/2} \prod_{m=0}^{M} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \Gamma(\nu_m + j). \tag{2.8}$$

Proof. First, let us consider the simplest situation, that is a product of square matrices, i.e. $\nu_1 = \cdots = \nu_M = 0$. As the eigenvalue PDF of an $n \times n$ GUE matrix is given by (2.6) with $M = 0$, the theorem follows immediately by applying Lemma 2 M times.

We need to be a little more careful when the case of rectangular matrices is considered. The $M = 1$ case of the theorem is again an immediate consequence of Lemma 2, which gives us the eigenvalues of $W_1 = G_1^{\dagger} H G_1$. However, in order to apply Lemma 2 a second time and find the non-zero eigenvalues of $W_2 = G_2^{\dagger} W_1 G_2$, we have to take into account that W_1 has an zero eigenvalue

with multiplicity ν_1. To proceed, we can use the same idea as in [29]. The unitary invariance of Gaussian matrices tells us that $W_1 \overset{d}{=} U^\dagger W_1 U$ and $G_2 \overset{d}{=} V G_2$ for any $U, V \in U(n+\nu_1)$. It follows that

$$W_2 = G_2^\dagger W_1 G_2 \overset{d}{=} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{G}_2^\dagger & g_2^\dagger \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{G}_2 \\ g_2 \end{bmatrix} = \tilde{G}_2^\dagger X_1 \tilde{G}_2, \tag{2.9}$$

where $X_1 = \operatorname{diag}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is an $n \times n$ diagonal matrix distributed according to (2.6) with $M = 1$, while $\tilde{G}_2$ and g_2 are standard Gaussian matrices of size $n \times (n+\nu_2)$ and $\nu_1 \times (n+\nu_2)$, respectively. Now, Lemma 2 can be applied to the right-hand side in (2.9), which gives us the PDF of the non-zero eigenvalues of W_2. Repeating this procedure completes the proof. □

Remark 5. We note that the case $M = 1$ of Theorem 4 is in agreement with the result stated by Kumar [38, Eq. (46) and (47)]. However, the derivation therein seems incomplete.

There are many other representations for the weight functions in Theorem 4 beyond the recursive definition (2.7). As usual, it is particularly useful for analytic purposes to write the weight functions in their contour integral representation.

Lemma 6. *We have*

$$g_j^{(M)}(x) = \frac{(\operatorname{sgn} x)^j}{4\pi i} \int_{c-i\infty}^{c+i\infty} ds\, |x|^s\, \Gamma\Big(\frac{j-s}{2}\Big) \prod_{m=1}^{M} \Gamma(\nu_m - s), \tag{2.10}$$

where $c < 0$ is a negative constant.

Proof. By means of the residue theorem, it is seen that

$$g_j^{(0)}(x) = x^j e^{-x^2} = \frac{(\operatorname{sgn} x)^j}{4\pi i} \int_{c-i\infty}^{c+i\infty} ds\, |x|^s\, \Gamma\Big(\frac{j-s}{2}\Big). \tag{2.11}$$

Now, assume that $g_j^{(M-1)}(x)$ is given by (2.10). From the recursive formula (2.7), we have

$$g_j^{(M)}(x) = \int_0^\infty \frac{dy}{y}\, y^{\nu_M} e^{-y}\, \frac{(\operatorname{sgn} x)^j}{4\pi i} \int_{c-i\infty}^{c+i\infty} ds \Big(\frac{|x|}{y}\Big)^s \Gamma\Big(\frac{j-s}{2}\Big) \prod_{m=1}^{M-1} \Gamma(\nu_m - s). \tag{2.12}$$

It is a straightforward exercise to show that the integrals may be interchanged. Thus, we have

$$g_j^{(M)}(x) = \frac{(\operatorname{sgn} x)^j}{4\pi i} \int_{c-i\infty}^{c+i\infty} ds\, |x|^s\, \Gamma\Big(\frac{j-s}{2}\Big) \prod_{m=1}^{M-1} \Gamma(\nu_m - s) \int_0^\infty \frac{dy}{y}\, y^{\nu_M - s} e^{-y} \tag{2.13}$$

and the lemma follows by induction. □

As already mentioned, functions with a contour integral representation like (2.10) have certain properties which are useful for analytical purposes. In fact, many of these properties may be found in the literature if we first recognise the contour integral as a Fox H-function

$$g_j^{(M)}(x) = \frac{(\operatorname{sgn} x)^j}{2} H_{0,M+1}^{M+1,0}\left(\begin{matrix} - \\ (\nu_1, 1), \dots, (\nu_M, 1), (\frac{j}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) \end{matrix} \middle| \, |x| \right) \tag{2.14}$$

or as a Meijer G-function

$$g_j^{(M)}(x) = (\operatorname{sgn} x)^j \prod_{m=1}^{M} \frac{2^{\nu_m - 1}}{\sqrt{\pi}} G_{0,2M+1}^{2M+1,0}\left(\begin{matrix} - \\ \frac{\nu_1}{2}, \frac{\nu_1+1}{2}, \dots, \frac{\nu_M}{2}, \frac{\nu_M+1}{2}, \frac{j}{2} \end{matrix} \middle| \, \frac{x^2}{4^M} \right). \tag{2.15}$$

We refer to the book [40] for an extensive review of these functions.

As discussed in Section 1.2, one of our goals is to find a 'classical gas' approximation for (2.6). For this purpose, we can use the asymptotic result [16]

$$G^{q,0}_{0,q}\left(\begin{matrix}-\\ b_1,\dots,b_q\end{matrix}\,\middle|\,x\right)\sim\frac{1}{q^{1/2}}\left(\frac{2\pi}{x^{1/q}}\right)^{(q-1)/2}x^{(b_1+\cdots+b_q)/q}e^{-qx^{1/q}}\big(1+O(x^{1/q})\big),\tag{2.16}$$

for $x\to\infty$ (recall that a typical eigenvalue grows with n). This immediately allows us to find a Muttalib–Borodin model (1.13), which approximates the product ensemble (2.6). However, for notational simplicity, it is convenient to first make a change of variables

$$x_i\mapsto x_i'=2^M\left(\frac{y_i}{\sqrt{2M+1}}\right)^{2M+1}\tag{2.17}$$

for $i=1,\dots,n$. Using the asymptotic formula (2.16) and making a change of variable (2.17), we find the approximate PDF

$$\tilde{P}^{(M)}(y_1,\dots,y_n)=\frac{1}{\tilde{Z}^{(M)}}\prod_{1\le i<j\le n}(y_j-y_i)(y_j^{2M+1}-y_i^{2M+1})\prod_{k=1}^n|y_k|^\alpha e^{-y_k^2},\tag{2.18}$$

where $\tilde{Z}^{(M)}$ is a new normalisation constant and $\alpha=\sum_{m=1}^M(2\nu_m+1)$. We recognise (2.18) as the Hermite Muttalib–Borodin model (1.2). Note that the approximation (2.16) is valid for large x and that the absolute value of a typical eigenvalue grows with the matrix dimension n. Thus, one might suspect agreement between the two models in the large-n limit except for local correlations near the origin. We will return to a comparison between the two models in Section 5 and Section 6.

It is worth noting that the following exact relation holds

$$G^{q,0}_{0,q}\left(\begin{matrix}-\\ 0,\frac{1}{q},\dots,\frac{q-1}{q}\end{matrix}\,\middle|\,x\right)=\frac{(2\pi)^{(q-1)/2}}{q^{1/2}}e^{-qx^{1/q}}\tag{2.19}$$

for integer q. This may be proven by writing the Meijer G-function on the left-hand side as its integral representation and then using Gauss' multiplication formula for the gamma functions. The exact relation (2.19) tells us that we can choose the parameters b_k $(k=1,\dots,q)$ in (2.16) such that all subleading terms in the expansion vanish.

3 Biorthogonality and correlations

It is well-known that bi-orthogonal ensembles such as (2.6) and (2.18) describe determinantal point processes. The correlation kernel may be written as

$$K_n(x,y)=\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\frac{p_k(x)\phi_k(x)}{h_k},\tag{3.1}$$

where $p_k(x)$ and $\phi_k(x)$ are bi-orthogonal functions with normalisation h_k, i.e.

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}dx\,p_k(x)\phi_k(x)=h_k\delta_{k\ell}.\tag{3.2}$$

In both cases the $p_k(x)$ will be a monic polynomial of degree k, while

$$\phi_k(x)-g_k^{(M)}(x)\in\operatorname{span}\{g_{k-1}^{(M)}(x),\dots,g_0^{(M)}(x)\}\tag{3.3}$$

for the product ensemble (2.6) and

$$\phi_k(x) - g_k^{(M)}(x) \in \operatorname{span}\{x^{(2M+1)(k-1)}|x|^\alpha e^{-x^2}, \dots, |x|^\alpha e^{-x^2}\} \tag{3.4}$$

for the Hermite Muttalib–Borodin model (2.18). In the latter case, the bi-orthogonal structure is already known [9, 12, 19, 33]. The main purpose of this section is to determine the bi-orthogonal functions — and consequently the kernel (3.1) — for the product ensemble (2.6).

3.1 The oddness of being even

For $M = 0$, the bi-orthogonal functions are $p_n(x) = \tilde{H}_n(x)$ and $\phi_n(x) = \tilde{H}_n(x)e^{-x^2}$ with $\tilde{H}_n(x)$ denoting the Hermite polynomials in monic normalisation. We recall that the n-th Hermite polynomials is an even (odd) function when n is even (odd); this is due to the reflection symmetry of the Gaussian weight about the origin. A similar phenomenon is present for our product generalisation. In order to see this, we use an alternative form of the kernel (3.1). We have [9, 15]

$$K_n(x,y) = \sum_{k,\ell=0}^{n-1} (B_n^{(M)})^{-1}_{\ell,k}\, x^k g_\ell^{(M)}(y), \tag{3.5}$$

where $B_n^{(M)} = (b_{i,j}^{(M)})_{i,j=0}^{n-1}$ is the n-th bi-moment matrix constructed from the bi-moments

$$b_{k,\ell}^{(M)} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x^k g_\ell^{(M)}(x)dx. \tag{3.6}$$

Simon [47] refers the inverse moment matrix representation (3.5) as the ABC (Aitken–Berg–Collar) theorem.

In the following, it will be useful to extend the concept of odd and even moments to bi-moments. We say that the bi-moments are odd (even) when $k+\ell$ is odd (even). Now, using that $g_\ell^{(M)}(-x) = (-1)^\ell g_\ell^{(M)}(x)$, we see that the bi-moments satisfy

$$b_{k,\ell}^{(M)} = (-1)^{k+\ell} b_{k,\ell}^{(M)}, \qquad k,\ell = 0,1,\dots, \tag{3.7}$$

which implies that all odd moments are equal to zero. In other words, the entries in the bi-moment matrix vanishes in a chequerboard pattern. Thus, by reordering rows and columns we may write the bi-moment matrix in a block diagonal form $B_n^{(M)} \mapsto \operatorname{diag}(B_n^{(M,\text{even})}, B_n^{(M,\text{odd})})$ with $B_n^{(M,\text{even})} = (b_{2k,2\ell}^{(M)})_{k,\ell}$ and $B_n^{(M,\text{odd})} = (b_{2k+1,2\ell+1}^{(M)})_{k,\ell}$. Using this reordering in the sum (3.5), we see that the kernel split into two parts

$$K_n(x,y) = K_n^{\text{even}}(x,y) + K_n^{\text{odd}}(x,y), \tag{3.8}$$

where

$$K_n^{\text{even}}(x,y) = \sum_{k,\ell=0}^{\lfloor\frac{n-1}{2}\rfloor} (B_n^{(M,\text{even})})^{-1}_{\ell,k}\, x^{2k} g_{2\ell}^{(M)}(y) = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor\frac{n-1}{2}\rfloor} \frac{p_{2k}(x)\phi_{2k}(x)}{h_{2k}}, \tag{3.9}$$

$$K_n^{\text{odd}}(x,y) = \sum_{k,\ell=0}^{\lfloor\frac{n}{2}\rfloor-1} (B_n^{(M,\text{odd})})^{-1}_{\ell,k}\, x^{2k+1} g_{2\ell+1}^{(M)}(y) = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor\frac{n}{2}\rfloor-1} \frac{p_{2k+1}(x)\phi_{2k+1}(x)}{h_{2k+1}}. \tag{3.10}$$

Here, the latter equality in both (3.9) and (3.10) follow from comparison with (3.1). Finally, we note that

$$K_{2n}^{\text{even}}(x,y) = K_{2n-1}^{\text{even}}(x,y) \qquad \text{and} \qquad K_{2n}^{\text{odd}}(x,y) = K_{2n+1}^{\text{even}}(x,y). \tag{3.11}$$

Thus, in the following we can restrict our attention to kernels with an even subscript.

3.2 Bi-orthogonal functions

We are now ready to write down the bi-orthogonal polynomials for our product ensemble. As explained in the previous subsection, it is convenient to consider functions of odd and even degree separately.

Proposition 7. *The ensemble defined by Theorem 4 is bi-orthogonalised by*

$$p_{2n}(x) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{n} \frac{(-\frac{1}{4})^{n-\ell}}{(n-\ell)!} \prod_{m=0}^{M} \frac{\Gamma(\nu_m + 2n + 1)}{\Gamma(\nu_m + 2\ell + 1)} x^{2\ell}, \qquad \phi_{2n}(x) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{n} \frac{(-\frac{1}{4})^{n-\ell}}{(n-\ell)!} \frac{(2n)!}{(2\ell)!} g_{2\ell}^{(M)}(x),$$

$$p_{2n+1}(x) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{n} \frac{(-\frac{1}{4})^{n-\ell}}{(n-\ell)!} \prod_{m=0}^{M} \frac{\Gamma(\nu_m + 2n + 2)}{\Gamma(\nu_m + 2\ell + 2)} x^{2\ell+1}, \quad \phi_{2n+1}(x) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{n} \frac{(-\frac{1}{4})^{n-\ell}}{(n-\ell)!} \frac{(2n+1)!}{(2\ell+1)!} g_{2\ell+1}^{(M)}(x),$$

$$h_n = 2^{-n} \pi^{1/2} \prod_{m=0}^{M} \Gamma(\nu_m + n + 1) \tag{3.12}$$

with notation as above (recall that $\nu_0 = 0$).

There are several different approaches to prove Proposition 7. Here, we will present a method which emphasizes the relation to the Hermite polynomials (see [28, Prop. 3.5] for the same method applied to the product ensemble of Laguerre-type). In order to use this approach, it is convenient to first calculate the bi-moments.

Lemma 8. *The bi-moments are given by*

$$b_{k,\ell}^{(M)} = \Gamma\Big(\frac{k+\ell+1}{2}\Big) \prod_{m=1}^{M} \Gamma(\nu_m + k + 1), \tag{3.13}$$

for $k + \ell$ even and zero otherwise. The bi-moment determinant is

$$D_n^{(M)} := \det_{0 \le k,\ell \le n} [b_{k\ell}^{(M)}] = 2^{-n(n+1)/2} \pi^{(n+1)/2} \prod_{m=0}^{M} \prod_{j=0}^{n} \Gamma(\nu_m + j + 1). \tag{3.14}$$

Proof. We insert the contour integral representation of the weight functions (2.10) into the expression for the bi-moments (3.6), then we see that the even moments are

$$b_{k\ell} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_0^\infty dx \int_{c-i\infty}^{c+i\infty} ds\, x^s\, \Gamma\Big(\frac{k+\ell-s}{2}\Big) \prod_{m=1}^{M} \Gamma(\nu_m + k - s). \tag{3.15}$$

The integrals in this expression can be recognised as a combination of a Mellin and an inverse Mellin transform, which yields (3.13).

In order to evaluate the bi-moment determinant (3.14), we note that

$$D_n^{(M)} = \prod_{m=1}^{M} \prod_{j=0}^{n} \Gamma(\nu_m + j + 1) \det_{0 \le k,\ell \le n} [b_{k\ell}^{(M=0)}]. \tag{3.16}$$

This completes the proof, since the $M = 0$ case is the well-known Hermite (or GUE) case. □

Proof of Proposition 7. The bi-orthogonal functions may be expressed by means of their bi-moments exactly as orthogonal polynomials through their moments. Thus, we have

$$p_n(x) = \frac{1}{D_{n-1}^{(M)}} \det_{\substack{i=0,\dots,n \\ j=0,\dots,n-1}} \left[b_{i,j}^{(M)} \middle| x^i \right] \qquad \text{and} \qquad \phi_n(x) = \frac{1}{D_{n-1}^{(M)}} \det_{\substack{i=0,\dots,n-1 \\ j=0,\dots,n}} \left[\frac{b_{i,j}^{(M)}}{g_j^{(M)}(x)} \right]. \tag{3.17}$$

Furthermore, we have $h_n = D_n^{(M)}/D_{n-1}^{(M)}$.

The constants h_n are immediate from the above and (3.14). Thus, it remains only to find the bi-orthogonal functions. To do so, we first note that

$$p_n(x) = \frac{\prod_{k=0}^{n} \prod_{m=1}^{M} \Gamma(\nu_m + k + 1)}{D_{n-1}^{(M)}} \det_{\substack{i=0,\dots,n \\ j=0,\dots,n-1}} \left[b_{i,j}^{(M=0)} \middle| \frac{x^i}{\prod_{m=1}^{M} \Gamma(\nu_m + i + 1)} \right], \tag{3.18}$$

$$\phi_n(x) = \frac{\prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \prod_{m=1}^{M} \Gamma(\nu_m + k + 1)}{D_{n-1}^{(M)}} \det_{\substack{i=0,\dots,n-1 \\ j=0,\dots,n}} \left[\frac{b_{i,j}^{(M=0)}}{g_j^{(M)}(x)} \right]. \tag{3.19}$$

This observation is important, since we know that the monic Hermite polynomials are given by

$$\tilde{H}_n(x) = 2^{-n} H_n(x) = \frac{1}{D_{n-1}^{(M=0)}} \det_{\substack{i=0,\dots,n \\ j=0,\dots,n-1}} \left[b_{i,j}^{(M=0)} \middle| x^i \right]. \tag{3.20}$$

It follows that the expressions for the bi-orthogonal function $p_n(x)$ and $\phi_n(x)$ can be found using the known expressions for the Hermite polynomials and then making substitutions

$$x^k \mapsto \frac{x^k}{\prod_{m=1}^{M} \Gamma(\nu_m + k + 1)} \qquad \text{and} \qquad x^k \mapsto g_k^{(M)}(x), \tag{3.21}$$

respectively. We recall that

$$\tilde{H}_{2n}(x) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{n} \frac{(-1)^{n-\ell}}{(n-\ell)!} \frac{(2n)!}{(2\ell)!} \frac{(2x)^{2\ell}}{2^{2n}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{H}_{2n+1}(x) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{n} \frac{(-1)^{n-\ell}}{(n-\ell)!} \frac{(2n+1)!}{(2\ell+1)!} \frac{(2x)^{2\ell+1}}{2^{2n+1}},$$

which makes it a straightforward exercise to verify the proposition. □

Remark 9. We recall that the bi-orthogonal functions also can be obtained from the characteristic polynomial using that

$$p_N(x) = \left\langle \det[x\mathbb{I}_N - W_N] \right\rangle \qquad \text{and} \qquad \int_{\mathbb{R}} dx \, \frac{\phi_{N-1}(x)}{z-x} = \left\langle \frac{1}{\det[z\mathbb{I}_N - W_N]} \right\rangle \tag{3.22}$$

with $\langle \cdots \rangle$ denoting the matrix average and $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$. The first relation allows for an alternative method to calculate $p_N(x)$; see e.g. [20].

4 Integral representations and correlation kernels

The explicit expressions for the bi-orthogonal functions given by Proposition 7 allow us to write down the correlation kernel by insertion in (3.1). However, this formulation of the kernel is not optimal for asymptotic analysis. For this reason, we will in this section provide integral representations of the bi-orthogonal functions as well as the kernel.

Proposition 10. *The bi-orthogonal functions given by Proposition 7 have integral representations*

$$p_{2n}(|x|) = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}(2n)!}{(-1)^n 2^{2n}} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_\Sigma ds\, |x|^{2s} \frac{\Gamma(-s)}{\Gamma(n+1-s)\Gamma(s+\frac{1}{2})} \prod_{m=1}^{M} \frac{\Gamma(\nu_m+2n+1)}{\Gamma(\nu_m+2s+1)}, \tag{4.1}$$

$$p_{2n+1}(|x|) = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}(2n+1)!}{(-1)^n 2^{2n+1}} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_\Sigma ds\, |x|^{2s+1} \frac{\Gamma(-s)}{\Gamma(n+1-s)\Gamma(s+\frac{3}{2})} \prod_{m=1}^{M} \frac{\Gamma(\nu_m+2n+2)}{\Gamma(\nu_m+2s+2)}, \tag{4.2}$$

$$\frac{\phi_{2n}(|x|)}{h_{2n}} = \frac{(-1)^n\, 2^{2n}}{\sqrt{\pi}(2n)!} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{c-i\infty}^{c+i\infty} dt\, |x|^{-2t-1} \frac{\Gamma(n-t)\Gamma(t+\frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(-t)} \prod_{m=1}^{M} \frac{\Gamma(\nu_m+2t+1)}{\Gamma(\nu_m+2n+1)}, \tag{4.3}$$

$$\frac{\phi_{2n+1}(|x|)}{h_{2n+1}} = \frac{(-1)^n\, 2^{2n+1}}{\sqrt{\pi}(2n+1)!} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{c-i\infty}^{c+i\infty} dt\, |x|^{-2t-2} \frac{\Gamma(n-t)\Gamma(t+\frac{3}{2})}{\Gamma(-t)} \prod_{m=1}^{M} \frac{\Gamma(\nu_m+2t+2)}{\Gamma(\nu_m+2n+2)}, \tag{4.4}$$

where the contour Σ encloses the integers $0, 1, \ldots, n$ in the negative direction and $-\frac{1}{2} < c < 0$. We recall that $p_{2n}(x)$ and $\phi_{2n}(x)$ are even functions, while $p_{2n+1}(x)$ and $\phi_{2n+1}(x)$ are odd functions.

Proof. The integrands in (4.1) and (4.2) has $n+1$ simple poles located at $0, 1, \ldots, n$, thus the series representations in Proposition 7 follow upon a straightforward application of the residue theorem.

In order to find the integral representation of the bi-orthogonal functions $\phi_n(x)$, we first note that the weight functions can be written as

$$g_\ell^{(M)}(x) = (\operatorname{sgn} x)^\ell \int_0^\infty \frac{dy}{y}\, y^\ell\, e^{-y^2} G_{0,M}^{M,0}\left(\begin{matrix} - \\ \nu_1, \ldots, \nu_M \end{matrix} \middle| \frac{|x|}{y} \right); \tag{4.5}$$

this is easily seen starting from the recursive definition (2.7). Now, using (4.5) in the expression for $\phi_n(x)$ (cf. Proposition 7), we see that

$$\phi_n(x) = \int_0^\infty \frac{dy}{y} e^{-y^2} \tilde{H}_n(y) G_{0,M}^{M,0}\left(\begin{matrix} - \\ \nu_1, \ldots, \nu_M \end{matrix} \middle| \frac{|x|}{y} \right). \tag{4.6}$$

In other words, the bi-orthogonal functions $\phi_n(x)$ are an integral transform of the Hermite polynomials with respect to a Meijer G-function as integral kernel. Moreover, such integrals are known from the literature on Meijer G- and Fox H-functions [40]. □

Proposition 11. *Integral representations of the even and odd kernels are*

$$K_{2n}^{\text{even}}(x,y) = \frac{1}{2(2\pi i)^2} \int_{c-i\infty}^{c+i\infty} dt \oint_\Sigma ds\, \frac{|x|^s |y|^{-t-1}}{s-t} \frac{\Gamma(-\frac{s}{2})\Gamma(\frac{t+1}{2})}{\Gamma(-\frac{t}{2})\Gamma(\frac{s+1}{2})} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{2n-t}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{2n-s}{2})} \prod_{m=1}^{M} \frac{\Gamma(\nu_m+t+1)}{\Gamma(\nu_m+s+1)},$$

$$K_{2n}^{\text{odd}}(x,y) = \frac{\operatorname{sgn}(xy)}{2(2\pi i)^2} \int_{c-i\infty}^{c+i\infty} dt \oint_\Sigma ds\, \frac{|x|^s\, |y|^{-t-1}}{s-t} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{1-s}{2})\Gamma(\frac{t+2}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{1-t}{2})\Gamma(\frac{s+2}{2})} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{2n-t+1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{2n-s+1}{2})} \prod_{m=1}^{M} \frac{\Gamma(\nu_m+t+1)}{\Gamma(\nu_m+s+1)}, \tag{4.7}$$

with $-1 < c < 0$ and the contour Σ is chosen such that it encircles $0, 1, \ldots, 2n-1$ in the negative direction with $\operatorname{Re}\{s\} > c$ for all $s \in \Sigma$.

Proof. As the proofs for the odd and even kernels are almost identical, we provide only the proof for the even case. The odd case is easily verified by the reader.

It follows the definition of the even kernel (3.9) together with contour integral representation of the bi-orthogonal functions from Proposition 10, that

$$K_{2n}^{\text{even}}(x,y) = \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^2}\int dt \oint_\Sigma ds\, |x|^{2s}|y|^{-2t-1}\frac{\Gamma(-s)\Gamma(t+\frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(-t)\Gamma(s+\frac{1}{2})}\prod_{m=1}^{M}\frac{\Gamma(\nu_m+2t+1)}{\Gamma(\nu_m+2s+1)}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\frac{\Gamma(k-t)}{\Gamma(k+1-s)}. \tag{4.8}$$

Following similar steps as in [37], we note the sum allows a telescopic evaluation. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} K_{2n}^{\text{even}}(x,y) = {} & \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^2}\int_{c-i\infty}^{c+i\infty} dt \oint_\Sigma ds\, \frac{|x|^{2s}|y|^{-2t-1}}{s-t}\frac{\Gamma(-s)\Gamma(t+\frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(-t)\Gamma(s+\frac{1}{2})}\frac{\Gamma(n-t)}{\Gamma(n-s)}\prod_{m=1}^{M}\frac{\Gamma(\nu_m+2t+1)}{\Gamma(\nu_m+2s+1)} \\ & - \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^2}\int_{c-i\infty}^{c+i\infty} dt \oint_\Sigma ds\, \frac{|x|^{2s}|y|^{-2t-1}}{s-t}\frac{\Gamma(t+\frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(s+\frac{1}{2})}\prod_{m=1}^{M}\frac{\Gamma(\nu_m+2t+1)}{\Gamma(\nu_m+2s+1)}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

Here, the integrand on the second line is zero as it has no poles encircled by the contour Σ and, thus

$$K_{2n}^{\text{even}}(x,y) = \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^2}\int_{c-i\infty}^{c+i\infty} dt \oint_\Sigma ds\, \frac{|x|^{2s}|y|^{-2t-1}}{s-t}\frac{\Gamma(-s)\Gamma(t+\frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(-t)\Gamma(s+\frac{1}{2})}\frac{\Gamma(n-t)}{\Gamma(n-s)}\prod_{m=1}^{M}\frac{\Gamma(\nu_m+2t+1)}{\Gamma(\nu_m+2s+1)}. \tag{4.10}$$

Finally, the proposition follows by a change of variables $s \mapsto s/2$ and $t \mapsto t/2$. □

The above integral representations for the bi-orthogonal functions and the kernel are probably the most convenient form for further asymptotic analysis as we will see in Section 5. However, it is also often helpful to express these formulae in terms of special functions as it allows for use of pre-defined mathematical software. Furthermore, such reformulations often guide us to recognise patterns which otherwise would have been left unseen.

The integral representations for the bi-orthogonal functions given by Proposition 10 can also be recognised as several different types of special function; this includes generalised hypergeometric, Meijer G-, and Fox H-functions. Here, we will restrict ourselves to their Meijer G-function formulation.

Let us first consider the bi-orthogonal polynomials which may be written as

$$\begin{aligned} p_{2n}(x) &= \frac{(-1)^n}{2^{2n}}\prod_{m=0}^{M}\frac{\Gamma(\nu_m+2n+1)}{2^{\nu_m}\pi^{-1/2}}G^{1,0}_{1,2M+2}\left(\begin{matrix} n+1 \\ -\frac{\nu_0}{2}, -\frac{\nu_0}{2}+\frac{1}{2}, \ldots, -\frac{\nu_M}{2}, -\frac{\nu_M}{2}+\frac{1}{2}\end{matrix}\middle| \frac{x^2}{2^{2M}}\right), \\ \frac{p_{2n+1}(x)}{x} &= \frac{(-1)^n}{2^{2n}}\prod_{m=0}^{M}\frac{\Gamma(\nu_m+2n+2)}{2^{\nu_m+1}\pi^{-1/2}}G^{1,0}_{1,2M+2}\left(\begin{matrix} n+1 \\ -\frac{\nu_0}{2}, -\frac{\nu_0}{2}-\frac{1}{2}, \ldots, -\frac{\nu_M}{2}, -\frac{\nu_M}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\end{matrix}\middle| \frac{x^2}{2^{2M}}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

It is worth comparing these polynomials with the polynomial found in the study of the Laguerre-like matrix product (1.10). Akemann et al. [3] found that in this case the bi-orthogonal polynomial is given by

$$P_n^{(M)}(x) = (-1)^n\prod_{m=0}^{M}\Gamma(\nu_m+n+1)G^{1,0}_{0,M+1}\left(\begin{matrix} n+1 \\ -\nu_0, -\nu_1, \ldots, -\nu_M\end{matrix}\middle| x\right). \tag{4.12}$$

It is clear that the two families of polynomials are related as

$$p_{2n}(x) \propto P_n^{(2M+1)}\left(\frac{x^2}{2^{2M}}\right) \qquad \text{and} \qquad p_{2n+1}(x) \propto xP_n^{(2M+1)}\left(\frac{x^2}{2^{2M}}\right) \tag{4.13}$$

with

$$\{\nu_m\}_{m=0}^M \mapsto \{\nu_m/2, (\nu_m-1)/2\}_{m=0}^M \qquad \text{and} \qquad \{\nu_m\}_{m=0}^M \mapsto \{\nu_m/2, (\nu_m+1)/2\}_{m=0}^M, \tag{4.14}$$

respectively. This is a generalisation of the relation between Hermite and Laguerre polynomials. Recall that

$$\tilde{H}_{2n}(x) = \tilde{L}_n^{(-\frac{1}{2})}(x^2) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \tilde{H}_{2n+1}(x) = x\tilde{L}_n^{(+\frac{1}{2})}(x^2), \tag{4.15}$$

where $\tilde{H}_n(x)$ and $\tilde{L}_n^{(\alpha)}(x)$ denote the Hermite and Laguerre polynomials in monic normalisation.

Likewise, the (non-polynomial) bi-orthogonal functions may be written as

$$\frac{\phi_{2n}(|x|)}{|x|} = (-1)^n \prod_{m=1}^M \frac{2^{\nu_m-2}}{\pi^{1/2}} G^{2M+1,1}_{1,2M+2}\left(\begin{matrix} -n \\ \frac{\nu_M}{2}-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\nu_M}{2}, \ldots, \frac{\nu_0}{2}-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\nu_0}{2} \end{matrix} \middle| \frac{x^2}{2^{2M}} \right), \tag{4.16}$$

$$\phi_{2n+1}(|x|) = (-1)^n \prod_{m=1}^M \frac{2^{\nu_m-1}}{\pi^{1/2}} G^{2M+1,1}_{1,2M+2}\left(\begin{matrix} -n \\ \frac{\nu_M}{2}+\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\nu_M}{2}, \ldots, \frac{\nu_0}{2}+\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\nu_0}{2} \end{matrix} \middle| \frac{x^2}{2^{2M}} \right). \tag{4.17}$$

Again, we want to compare to the formula in [3] which this time reads

$$\Phi_n^{(M)}(x) = (-1)^n G^{M,1}_{1,M+1}\left(\begin{matrix} -n \\ \nu_M, \ldots, \nu_1, \nu_0 \end{matrix} \middle| x \right). \tag{4.18}$$

Evidently, we have the following relations

$$\phi_{2n}(|x|) \propto |x| \Phi_n^{(2M+1)}\left(\frac{x^2}{2^{2M}}\right) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \phi_{2n+1}(|x|) \propto \Phi_n^{(2M+1)}\left(\frac{x^2}{2^{2M}}\right), \tag{4.19}$$

with (4.14) as before. Yet again, this is a generalisation of the relation between Hermite and Laguerre polynomials. In the simplest case the relations (4.19) reduces to

$$\tilde{H}_{2n}(x) w_{\mathrm{H}}(x) = |x| \tilde{L}_n^{(-\frac{1}{2})}(x^2) w_{\mathrm{L}}^{(-\frac{1}{2})}(x^2) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \tilde{H}_{2n+1}(|x|) w_{\mathrm{H}}(x) = \tilde{L}_n^{(+\frac{1}{2})}(x^2) w_{\mathrm{L}}^{(\frac{1}{2})}(x^2),$$

where $w_{\mathrm{H}}(x) = e^{-x^2}$ and $w_{\mathrm{L}}^{(\alpha)}(x) = x^\alpha e^{-x}$ are the Hermite and Laguerre weight functions.

It is, of course, well-known that there are relations between ensembles which reflection symmetry about origin and ensembles on the half-line (albeit explicit formulae may be elusive). A general description of such relations in the Muttalib–Borodin models can be found in [19].

5 Scaling limits at the origin in product and Muttalib–Borodin ensembles

With the integral representations of the correlation kernels established by Proposition 11, we can turn to a study of asymptotic properties. Perhaps, the most interesting scaling regime is that of the local correlations near the origin referred to as the hard edge when the eigenvalues are strictly positive. For other product ensembles [18, 21, 32, 37], it has been observed that correlations at the hard edge is determined by the so-called Meijer G-kernel, which generalises the more familiar Bessel kernel. Below, we will see that the Meijer G-kernel appears once again, but this time in slightly different manner.

Theorem 12. *For $x, y \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, the microscopic limit near the origin is*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} K_{2n}\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{n}}, \frac{y}{\sqrt{n}}\right) = K^{\mathrm{even}}(x,y) + K^{\mathrm{odd}}(x,y) \tag{5.1}$$

with

$$K^{\text{even}}(x,y) = \frac{1}{2(2\pi i)^2}\int_{c-i\infty}^{c+i\infty} dt \int_\Sigma ds\, \frac{|x|^s|y|^{-t-1}}{s-t}\frac{\Gamma(-\frac{s}{2})\Gamma(\frac{t+1}{2})}{\Gamma(-\frac{t}{2})\Gamma(\frac{s+1}{2})}\prod_{m=1}^{M}\frac{\Gamma(\nu_m+t+1)}{\Gamma(\nu_m+s+1)}, \tag{5.2}$$

$$K^{\text{odd}}(x,y) = \frac{\operatorname{sgn}(xy)}{2(2\pi i)^2}\int_{c-i\infty}^{c+i\infty} dt \int_\Sigma ds\, \frac{|x|^s|y|^{-t-1}}{s-t}\frac{\Gamma(\frac{1-s}{2})\Gamma(\frac{t+2}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{1-t}{2})\Gamma(\frac{s+2}{2})}\prod_{m=1}^{M}\frac{\Gamma(\nu_m+t+1)}{\Gamma(\nu_m+s+1)}, \tag{5.3}$$

where $-1 < c < 0$ *and* Σ *encloses the non-negative half-line in the negative direction starting and ending at* $+\infty$ *such that* $\operatorname{Re}\{s\} > c$ *for all* $s \in \Sigma$.

Proof. Using that

$$\frac{\Gamma(n-\frac{t}{2})}{\Gamma(n-\frac{s}{2})} = n^{(s-t)/2}\big(1+O(n^{-1})\big) \tag{5.4}$$

in the integral representation of the even kernel (Proposition 11), we see that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}K_{2n}^{\text{even}}\Big(\frac{x}{\sqrt{n}},\frac{y}{\sqrt{n}}\Big) = \frac{1}{2(2\pi i)^2}\int dt\int ds\, \frac{|x|^s|y|^{-t-1}}{s-t}\frac{\Gamma(-\frac{s}{2})\Gamma(\frac{t+1}{2})}{\Gamma(-\frac{t}{2})\Gamma(\frac{s+1}{2})}\prod_{m=1}^{M}\frac{\Gamma(\nu_m+t+1)}{\Gamma(\nu_m+s+1)}\big(1+O(n^{-1})\big). \tag{5.5}$$

An exchange of the large-n limit and the integrations can be justified by means of dominated convergence theorem yielding (5.2). A similar result holds for the odd kernel, which completes the proof. □

For a comparison with other known results, it is useful to rewrite the hard edge correlation function of Theorem 12 in terms of Meijer G-functions. Using that

$$\int_0^1 du\, u^{s-t-1} = \frac{1}{s-t}, \tag{5.6}$$

we see that the even and odd kernel can be written as

$$K^{\text{even}}(|x|,|y|) = \frac{|y|}{2^{2M}}\int_0^1 du\, G^{1,0}_{0,2M+2}\left(\begin{matrix}-\\ -\frac{\nu_0}{2}, -\frac{\nu_0}{2}+\frac{1}{2}, \dots, -\frac{\nu_M}{2}, -\frac{\nu_M}{2}+\frac{1}{2}\end{matrix}\,\middle|\, \frac{x^2}{2^{2M}}u\right) \times G^{2M+1,0}_{0,2M+2}\left(\begin{matrix}-\\ \frac{\nu_M}{2}-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\nu_M}{2}, \dots, \frac{\nu_0}{2}-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\nu_0}{2}\end{matrix}\,\middle|\, \frac{y^2}{2^{2M}}u\right), \tag{5.7}$$

$$K^{\text{odd}}(|x|,|y|) = \frac{|x|}{2^{2M}}\int_0^1 du\, G^{1,0}_{0,2M+2}\left(\begin{matrix}-\\ -\frac{\nu_0}{2}, -\frac{\nu_0}{2}-\frac{1}{2}, \dots, -\frac{\nu_M}{2}, -\frac{\nu_M}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\end{matrix}\,\middle|\, \frac{x^2}{2^{2M}}u\right) \times G^{2M+1,0}_{0,2M+2}\left(\begin{matrix}-\\ \frac{\nu_M}{2}+\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\nu_M}{2}, \dots, \frac{\nu_0}{2}+\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\nu_0}{2}\end{matrix}\,\middle|\, \frac{y^2}{2^{2M}}u\right), \tag{5.8}$$

respectively. We recall that the so-called Meijer G-kernel is given by [37]

$$K^M_{\text{Meijer}}(x,y) = \int_0^1 du\, G^{1,0}_{0,M+1}\left(\begin{matrix}-\\ -\nu_0, \dots, -\nu_M\end{matrix}\,\middle|\, xu\right) G^{M,0}_{0,M+1}\left(\begin{matrix}-\\ \nu_M, \dots, \nu_0\end{matrix}\,\middle|\, yu\right) \tag{5.9}$$

with $x, y > 0$. We note that this kernel is single-sided ($x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+$) while the kernel from Theorem 12 is double-sided ($x, y \in \mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$). However, it is also evident that our new kernel may be re-expressed in terms of the Meijer G-kernel. We have

$$K^{\text{even}}(|x|,|y|) = \frac{|y|}{2^{2M}} K^{2M+1}_{\text{Meijer}}\Big(\frac{x^2}{2^{2M}}, \frac{y^2}{2^{2M}}\Big) \quad \text{and} \quad K^{\text{odd}}(|x|,|y|) = \frac{|x|}{2^{2M}} K^{2M+1}_{\text{Meijer}}\Big(\frac{x^2}{2^{2M}}, \frac{y^2}{2^{2M}}\Big) \tag{5.10}$$

with

$$\{\nu_m\}_{m=0}^M \mapsto \{\nu_m/2, (\nu_m - 1)/2\}_{m=0}^M \qquad \text{and} \qquad \{\nu_m\}_{m=0}^M \mapsto \{\nu_m/2, (\nu_m + 1)/2\}_{m=0}^M, \tag{5.11}$$

respectively. Thus, the random product matrix (1.1) provides yet another appearance of the Meijer G-kernel; albeit this time in a double-sided version. For graphical representation of the Meijer G-kernel we refer to [28, Fig. 3.2], which shows plots of the local density (i.e. the kernel with $x = y$) for different values of M.

A double-side hard edge scaling limit near the origin is also present in the Hermite Muttalib–Borodin model. In this case the kernel is found to be [9]

$$K^{\text{even}}(x,y) = K^{(\frac{\alpha-1}{2},\theta)}(x^2, y^2) \qquad \text{and} \qquad K^{\text{odd}}(x,y) = \operatorname{sgn}(xy)|x|^\theta |y|\, K^{(\frac{\alpha+\theta}{2},\theta)}(x^2, y^2) \tag{5.12}$$

where

$$K^{(\alpha,\theta)}(x,y) = \theta \int_0^1 du (xu)^\alpha J_{\frac{\alpha+1}{\theta},\frac{1}{\theta}}(xu) J_{\alpha+1,\theta}((yu)^\theta) \tag{5.13}$$

with $J_{a,b}(x)$ denoting Wright's Bessel function. In the case relevant to us (1.2), we also have $\theta = 2M + 1$. Furthermore, it is known from [36] that the kernel (5.13) is a Meijer G-kernel whenever θ is a positive integer. In particular, we have

$$\Big(\frac{x^2}{2^{2M}}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2M+1}-1} K^{(\alpha,2M+1)}\Big((2M+1)\Big(\frac{x^2}{2^{2M}}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2M+1}}, (2M+1)\Big(\frac{y^2}{2^{2M}}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2M+1}}\Big) = K^{2M+1}_{\text{Meijer}}\Big(\frac{y^2}{2^{2M}}, \frac{x^2}{2^{2M}}\Big), \tag{5.14}$$

where the Meijer G-kernel on the right-hand side has indices

$$\nu_m = \frac{\alpha + m - 1}{2M+1}, \qquad m = 1, \dots, 2M+1, \tag{5.15}$$

and as always $\nu_0 = 0$. It follows from (5.12) and (5.13) that the hard edge correlations for the Hermite Muttalib–Borodin model with appropriately chosen parameters may be expressed in terms of the Meijer G-kernel in a similar fashion as done for the product ensemble above. We note that the choice of variables in (5.13) should be compared to the change of variables (2.17) performed in the derivation of the asymptotic reduction (2.18).

As a final remark in this section, it is worth verifying consistency of the simplest scenario of $M = 0$ and investigating more specific expression in the case $M = 1$. When $M = 0$ our matrix ensemble (1.1) reduces to the GUE, hence the kernel given by Theorem 12 must reduce to the sine kernel for $M = 0$. To see this, we use

$$G^{1,0}_{0,2}\Big(\begin{matrix} - \\ 0, \frac{1}{2} \end{matrix}\Big| \frac{x^2}{4}\Big) = \frac{\cos x}{\sqrt{\pi}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad G^{1,0}_{0,2}\Big(\begin{matrix} - \\ \frac{1}{2}, 0 \end{matrix}\Big| \frac{x^2}{4}\Big) = \frac{\sin x}{\sqrt{\pi}}. \tag{5.16}$$

It follows that

$$K^{\text{even}}(x,y) = \frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{u}} \cos(2x\sqrt{u}) \cos(2y\sqrt{u}) = \frac{1}{\pi}\Big(\frac{\sin 2(x-y)}{2(x-y)} + \frac{\sin 2(x+y)}{2(x+y)}\Big), \tag{5.17}$$

$$K^{\text{odd}}(x,y) = \frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^1 \frac{du}{\sqrt{u}} \sin(2x\sqrt{u}) \sin(2y\sqrt{u}) = \frac{1}{\pi}\Big(\frac{\sin 2(x-y)}{2(x-y)} - \frac{\sin 2(x+y)}{2(x+y)}\Big), \tag{5.18}$$

which upon insertion into (5.1) indeed reproduces the sine kernel.

In the end of this section, let us emphasize that there also exists a complex contour representation of the limiting kernel in Theorem 12 which combines the odd and even into a single formula.

Proposition 13. *With the same notation as in Theorem 12, the limiting kernel at the origin can be rewritten as*

$$K^{\mathrm{even}}(x,y)+K^{\mathrm{odd}}(x,y)=2\,\mathcal{K}_{\nu_1,\ldots,\nu_M}(2x,2y), \tag{5.19}$$

where the kernel on the right-hand side is defined as

$$\mathcal{K}_{\nu_1,\ldots,\nu_M}(x,y)=\int_{C_R}\frac{dv}{2\pi i}\,G^{1,0}_{0,M+1}\left(\begin{matrix}-\\0,-\nu_1,\ldots,-\nu_M\end{matrix}\,\middle|\,-\mathrm{sgn}(y)xv\right)G^{M+1,0}_{0,M+1}\left(\begin{matrix}-\\0,\nu_1,\ldots,\nu_M\end{matrix}\,\middle|\,|y|v\right), \tag{5.20}$$

with C_R denoting a path in the right-half plane from $-i$ to i.

Proof. Using Euler's reflection formula and duplication formula for the gamma function, we see that

$$K^{\mathrm{even}}(x,y)+K^{\mathrm{odd}}(x,y)=\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^2}\int dt\int ds\,(2|x|)^s(2|y|)^{-t-1}\frac{g(s,t)}{s-t}\frac{\Gamma(t+1)}{\Gamma(s+1)}\prod_{m=1}^{M}\frac{\Gamma(\nu_m+t+1)}{\Gamma(\nu_m+s+1)},$$

where

$$g(s,t)=\frac{\sin\frac{\pi}{2}t}{\sin\frac{\pi}{2}s}+\mathrm{sgn}(xy)\frac{\cos\frac{\pi}{2}t}{\cos\frac{\pi}{2}s}. \tag{5.21}$$

In order to proceed, we will consider the cases $xy<0$ and $xy>0$ separately. For $xy<0$, it is seen that

$$g(s,t)=\frac{2}{\sin\pi s}\sin\frac{\pi}{2}(t-s)=-\frac{2}{\pi}\Gamma(-s)\Gamma(1+s)\,\sin\frac{\pi}{2}(t-s). \tag{5.22}$$

Now (5.19) can be obtained using the integral representation

$$\frac{1}{\pi i}\int_{C_R}dv\,v^{s-t-1}=\frac{1}{t-s}\sin\frac{\pi}{2}(t-s) \tag{5.23}$$

together with the definition of Meijer G-function. For $xy>0$, we note that

$$e^{i\pi s}g(s,t)=\left(\frac{\sin\frac{\pi}{2}t}{\sin\frac{\pi}{2}s}-\frac{\cos\frac{\pi}{2}t}{\cos\frac{\pi}{2}s}\right)+2e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}(t+s)}. \tag{5.24}$$

The s-variable integrand in the second part has no pole within the contour Σ. Thus, the problem reduces to the proven situation. □

The simplest non-trivial case is $M=1$. Here, we get

$$\mathcal{K}_{\nu}(x,y)=\left(\frac{y}{x}\right)^{\nu/2}\frac{1}{\pi i}\int_{C_R}dv\,I_\nu\big(2\sqrt{\mathrm{sgn}(y)xv}\big)\,K_\nu\big(2\sqrt{|y|v}\big), \tag{5.25}$$

with the modified Bessel functions I_ν and K_ν, which follows immediately from the fact that

$$G^{1,0}_{0,2}\left(\begin{matrix}-\\0,-\nu\end{matrix}\,\middle|\,-z\right)=z^{-\nu/2}I_\nu(2\sqrt{z}),\qquad G^{2,0}_{0,2}\left(\begin{matrix}-\\\nu,0\end{matrix}\,\middle|\,z\right)=2z^{\nu/2}K_\nu(2\sqrt{z}). \tag{5.26}$$

6 Global spectra in product and Muttalib–Borodin ensembles

The study of the scaling limit at the origin in the previous section introduces a scale in which the average spacing between eigenvalues is of order unity. A very different, but still well-defined, limiting process is the so-called global scaling regime. In this regime the average spacing between eigenvalues tends to zero in such way that the spectral density tends to a quantity $\rho(x)$ with compact support $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $\int_I \rho(x)dx = 1$. Here $\rho(x)$ is referred to as the global density.

For the Laguerre Muttalib–Borodin model specified by the density (1.12) the global scaling limit corresponds to a change of variables $x_j \mapsto nx_j$. Introducing the further change of variables $x_j \mapsto Mx_j^M$, the global density is known to be the so-called Fuss–Catalan density with parameter M. It is specified by the moment sequence

$$\mathrm{FC}_M(k) = \frac{1}{Mk+1}\binom{(M+1)k}{k}, \qquad k = 0, 1, \dots . \tag{6.1}$$

These are the Fuss–Catalan numbers (the Catalan numbers are the case $M = 1$).

Now, consider the product of M standard complex Gaussian random matrices. Consistent with the discussion in Section 1.2, the corresponding global density is again the Fuss–Catalan density with parameter M [5, 8, 41, 43].

It is known that the Fuss–Catalan density, $\rho_{\mathrm{FC}}^{(M)}(x)$ say, can also be characterised as the minimiser of the energy functional

$$E[\rho] = M\int_0^L dx\, \rho(x)x^{\frac{1}{M}} - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^L dx \int_0^L dy\, \rho(x)\rho(y)\log\left(|x-y||x^{\frac{1}{M}} - y^{\frac{1}{M}}|\right) \tag{6.2}$$

with $L = (M+1)^{M+1}/M^M$; see [14, 20, 22]. Note that the energy functional (6.2) relates to (1.12) through the aforementioned change of variables. Similarly, the energy functional corresponding to (1.2) is

$$\tilde{E}[\tilde{\rho}] = \theta\int_{-\tilde{L}}^{\tilde{L}} dx\, \rho(x)x^{\frac{2}{\theta}} - \frac{1}{2}\int_{-\tilde{L}}^{\tilde{L}} dx \int_{-\tilde{L}}^{\tilde{L}} dy\, \tilde{\rho}(x)\tilde{\rho}(y)\log\left(|x-y||\operatorname{sgn} x|x|^{\frac{1}{\theta}} - \operatorname{sgn} y|y|^{\frac{1}{\theta}}|\right) \tag{6.3}$$

$$= 2\theta\int_0^{\tilde{L}} dx\, \rho(x)x^{\frac{2}{\theta}} - \int_0^{\tilde{L}} dx \int_0^{\tilde{L}} dy\, \tilde{\rho}(x)\tilde{\rho}(y)\log\left(|x^2-y^2||(x^2)^{\frac{1}{\theta}} - (y^2)^{\frac{1}{\theta}}|\right) \tag{6.4}$$

with $\theta = 2M+1$. We note that changing variables $x^2 \mapsto x$ and $y^2 \mapsto y$, then setting $\tilde{\rho}(x) = x\rho(x^2)$ reduces (6.4) to (6.2) with $L = \tilde{L}^2$. Thus, the minimiser in (6.4) is given in terms of the Fuss-Catalan density

$$\tilde{\rho}(x) = |x|\rho_{\mathrm{FC}}^{(M)}(x^2) \tag{6.5}$$

and is symmetric about the origin.

As an illustration, let us consider the simplest case. For $M = 1$, the Fuss–Catalan density becomes the celebrated Machenko–Pastur density,

$$\rho_{\mathrm{FC}}^{(M=1)}(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\sqrt{\frac{4-x}{x}}, \qquad 0 < x < 4. \tag{6.6}$$

The formula (6.5) then gives the standard result (see e.g. [44]) that the energy functional

$$\tilde{E}[\tilde{\rho}] = \int_{-2}^{2} dx\, \tilde{\rho}(x)x^2 - \int_{-2}^{2} dx \int_{-2}^{2} dy\, \tilde{\rho}(x)\tilde{\rho}(y)\log|x-y| \tag{6.7}$$

is minimised by

$$\rho_{\text{Wigner}}(x) = \frac{\sqrt{4-x^2}}{2\pi}, \qquad -2 < x < 2, \tag{6.8}$$

which is Wigner's semi-circle law.

It has been demonstrated in Section 2, that the energy function implicit in (6.4) underlies the eigenvalue distribution of the random matrix product (1.1). Thus, we can anticipate that after appropriate scaling the global density for the product ensembles is given by (6.5). A direct proof of this can obtained through a number of different strategies. We consider first a method based on the characteristic polynomial.

In terms of the global scaled variables, the key equation relating the averaged characteristic polynomial to the the global is the asymptotic formula [24]

$$\frac{1}{n}\frac{d}{dz}\log\big\langle \det(zn^{M+\frac{1}{2}}\mathbb{I}_n - W_M)\big\rangle = \tilde{G}_M(z) + O(n^{-1}), \tag{6.9}$$

where $\tilde{G}_M(z)$ is the Stieltjes transform of the global spectral density,

$$\tilde{G}_M(z) = \int_{-\tilde{L}}^{\tilde{L}} dx\, \frac{\tilde{\rho}(x)}{z-x}. \tag{6.10}$$

Following the strategy first used in [20], the formula (6.9) leads to a characterisation of the Stieltjes transform (6.10), upon realising that the characteristic polynomial satisfy a linear differential equation.

Proposition 14. *Consider a matrix product (1.1) with even matrix dimension, $n = 2N$. Let*

$$f(z) = \big\langle \det(z\mathbb{I}_n - W_M)\big\rangle \tag{6.11}$$

denote the characteristic polynomial. Then (6.11) is a solution to the differential equation,

$$2z^2\Big(z\frac{d}{dz} - n\Big)f(z) = \prod_{m=0}^{M}\Big(z\frac{d}{dz} + \nu_m\Big)\Big(z\frac{d}{dz} + \nu_m - 1\Big)f(z), \tag{6.12}$$

which is of order $2M+2$.

Proof. The characteristic polynomial (6.11) is identical to the bi-orthogonal polynomial $p_{2n}(z)$. As shown earlier, this polynomial is proportional to a Meijer G-function (4.11). It is well-known that such Meijer G-functions satisfy the differential equation (6.12). □

Changing variables $z \mapsto n^{M+\frac{1}{2}}\hat{z}/\sqrt{2}$ in (6.12) and using that

$$\frac{f^{(k)}(\hat{z})}{f(\hat{z})} \sim \Big(\frac{f'(\hat{z})}{f(\hat{z})}\Big)^k \tag{6.13}$$

to leading order in n, we see that for large n the differential equation (6.12) reduces to the algebraic equation (see e.g. [7] for $M = 1$)

$$z^2(z\tilde{G}_M(z) - 1) = (z\tilde{G}_M(z))^{2M+2}. \tag{6.14}$$

This equation is to be compared to the algebraic equation satisfied by the Stieltjes transform of the Fuss–Catalan density,

$$z(zG_M(z) - 1) = (zG_M(z))^{M+1}, \tag{6.15}$$

see e.g. [20]. With $z \mapsto z^2$ and $M \mapsto 2M+1$ and setting $\tilde{G}_M(z) = zG_{2M+1}(z^2)$, we see that (6.15) reduces to (6.14). This prescription is equivalent to (6.5), thus verifying this formula as the evaluation of the global density.

The same result can also be obtained using free probability techniques. To see this, we need some additional notation. Let a be a non-commutative random variable with distribution $d\mu(x) = \rho(x)dx$. The Stieltjes transform $G_a(z)$ of the variable a is defined analogous to (6.10). The S-transform is defined as

$$S_a(z) = \frac{1+z}{z}\gamma^{-1}(z) \qquad \text{with} \qquad \gamma(z) = -1 + z^{-1}G_a(z^{-1}). \tag{6.16}$$

Now assume that a and b are two freely independent non-commutative random variables and that the Stieltjes transform $G_b(z)$ satisfies a functional equation $P(z, G_b(z)) = 0$. It is known [43] that under these conditions the Stieltjes transform $G_{ab}(z)$ of the product ab satisfies

$$P\Big(zS_a(zG_{ab}(z)-1), \frac{zG_{ab}(z)}{S_a(zG_{ab}(z)-1)}\Big) = 0. \tag{6.17}$$

Moreover, we know that if a is given by the free normal distribution (i.e. Wigner's semi-circle) and b is given by the free Poisson distribution (i.e. Marčenko–Pastur), then

$$S_a(z) = \frac{1}{1+z} \qquad \text{and} \qquad G_b(z)^2 - zG_b(z) + 1 = 0. \tag{6.18}$$

We can now use that the limiting distributions for the GUE and the Wishart ensemble are the free normal and the free Poisson, respectively. Thus, using (6.17) M times, we see that our product (1.1) indeed gives rise to the the functional equation (6.14).

It is also possible to construct a parametrisation of the global density in terms of elementary functions based on the polynomial equation (6.14). With

$$x_0^2 = \frac{\big(\sin((2M+2)\varphi)\big)^{2M+2}}{\sin\varphi\,\big(\sin((2M+1)\varphi)\big)^{2M+1}}, \qquad 0 \le \varphi \le \frac{\pi}{2M+2}, \tag{6.19}$$

we have

$$\tilde{\rho}(x_0) = \frac{1}{\pi}\sqrt{\frac{\sin\varphi}{\sin(2M+1)\varphi}}\left(\frac{\sin(2r+1)\varphi}{\sin(2M+2)\varphi}\right)^M \sin\varphi, \qquad 0 \le \varphi \le \frac{\pi}{2M+2}; \tag{6.20}$$

see e.g. [20]. It follows that the singularity at the origin blows up like

$$\tilde{\rho}(x_0) \sim \frac{1}{\pi}\sin\frac{\pi}{2M+2}\,|x_0|^{-\frac{M}{M+1}} \tag{6.21}$$

as $x_0 \to 0$.

Finally, it is worth stressing that we may make full use of the double integral for the correlation kernel in Proposition 11 and give an analytical proof of the global density. In fact, following the almost exactly same steps introduced in [39], we can prove that the sine-kernel arises in the bulk (as a corollary the limiting density then follows) and that Airy-kernel arises at the soft edge; cf. the proof of Theorems 1.1 and Theorem 1.3 as well as Remark 2 in [39]. A basic starting point is

to approximate the integrand by elementary functions and rewrite the kernel, say the even part, as

$$\frac{1}{n\tilde{\rho}(x_0)}\Big(\sqrt{\frac{2}{n}}\Big)^{2M+1} K_{2n}^{\text{even}}\Big(\Big(\sqrt{\frac{2}{n}}\Big)^{2M+1}\Big(\frac{x_0}{\sqrt{2}}+\frac{x}{\tilde{\rho}(x_0)n}\Big),\Big(\sqrt{\frac{2}{n}}\Big)^{2M+1}\Big(\frac{x_0}{\sqrt{2}}+\frac{x}{\tilde{\rho}(x_0)n}\Big)\Big)$$
$$\sim \frac{\sqrt{2}}{|x_0|\tilde{\rho}(x_0)}\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^2}\int dt\int ds\,\frac{e^{n(g(s)-g(t))}}{s-t}\Big|1+\frac{\sqrt{2}x}{x_0\tilde{\rho}(x_0)n}\Big|^{2ns}\Big|1+\frac{\sqrt{2}y}{x_0\tilde{\rho}(x_0)n}\Big|^{-2nt-1}\frac{h_n(s)}{h_n(t)}, \quad (6.22)$$

where the phase function

$$g(z)=(2M+1)z-2(M+1)z\log z+z\log(z-1)-\log(1-z)+z\log x_0^2. \quad (6.23)$$

Hence, the saddle point equation $g'(z)=0$ is exactly expressed through the equation (6.14). We stress that the above parametrisation representation plays a key role in the proof of the sine-kernel via the steepest decent method. Here we omit the details and leave them as an exercise for the reader.

Acknowledgements We thank S. Kumar for useful discussions on his paper and M. Kieburg for comments on a first draft. We acknowledge support by the Australian Research Council through grant DP170102028 (PJF), the ARC Centre of Excellence for Mathematical and Statistical Frontiers (PJF,JRI), and by the National Natural Science Foundation of China #11301499, the Youth Innovation Promotion Association CAS #2017491, the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities #WK3470000008, Anhui Provincial Natural Science Foundation #1708085QA03 (DZL).

A Three different proofs of Theorem 1

This appendix contains three separate proofs of Theorem 1. Each proof has its own merits and provides a different perspective on the matrix transformation.

The first proof is based on the method of additive rank-one deformations. A benefit of this method is that it avoids group integrals of Itzykson–Zuber-type, and therefore might be a more suitable starting point for generalisations to studies of real or quaternion matrices. The second proof is based on a theorem by Forrester and Rains [23] that gives the eigenvalue density of a Hermitised matrix product by means of an inverse double-sided Laplace transform. This idea is closely related to the spherical transforms used in the context of other matrix transformations [31, 35]. The third and final proof uses a generalisation of the Harish-Chandra–Itzykson–Zuber integral previously studied by Fyodorov [25, 26]. As a side result, we determine the proportionality constant of this group integral, which was left unspecified in the original papers.

The three proofs will be given in the three subsections below. However, before we start it is worth noting the following reduction result related to Theorem 1.

Remark 15. Suppose $n=N$, and consider the limit $a_{n_0+1}\to 0^+$. Recalling the ordering (1.5), inspection of (1.4) shows that its leading contribution comes from a Laplace expansion via the top left entry of the second determinant. This entry is in turn significant only for $x_{n_0+1}\to 0^+$, telling us that to leading order (1.4) with $n=N$ and $a_{n_0+1}\to 0^+$ is equal to

$$\frac{e^{-x_{n_0+1}/a_{n_0+1}}}{|a_{n_0+1}|}\prod_{l=1}^{N}\frac{1}{(N-l)!}\prod_{\substack{l=1\\ l\neq n_0+1}}^{N}|a_l|^{-2}|x_l|\prod_{\substack{1\le j<k\le N\\ j,k\neq n_0+1}}\frac{x_k-x_j}{a_k-a_j}\det\big[e^{-x_i/a_j}\big]_{i,j=1}^{n_0}\det\big[e^{-x_{i+n_0}/a_{j+n_0}}\big]_{i,j=2}^{N-n_0}. \quad (A.1)$$

After relabelling, (A.1) is equivalent to (1.4) with $n = N - 1$ times a Dirac delta function corresponding to an eigenvalue at zero. Repeating this limiting procedure a total of $N - n$ times shows that (1.4) in the case $n = N$ reduces to the general n case.

A.1 First proof: Recursive structure using additive rank-one deformations

In this section, we prove Theorem 1 by induction. The induction step will be constructed using the method of rank-one deformations. For the reader's convenience, we start by providing an outline of the proof; details will follow in the steps i), ii), and iii) below.

We first need some additional notation. Let $G^{(p)}$ denote the $p \times N$ matrix consisting of the first p rows of the $n \times N$ matrix complex Gaussian matrix G and let $A^{(p)} = \operatorname{diag}(a_1, \dots, a_p)$. Define

$$X^{(p)} = (G^{(p)})^\dagger A^{(p)} G^{(p)}, \qquad p = 1, \dots, n. \tag{A.2}$$

We see that $X^{(p)}$ is an $N \times N$ matrix and that $X^{(n)} = X$. Moreover, $X^{(p)}$ has rank (less or equal to) p and we therefore know that it has (at most) p non-zero eigenvalues; we will denote these eigenvalues $\lambda_k^{(p)}$ $(k = 1, \dots, p)$. The crucial observation is that $X^{(p)}$ is an additive rank-one deformation of $X^{(p-1)}$ for $p > 1$. More precisely, we have

$$X^{(p)} = X^{(p-1)} + a_p \, \vec{x} \, \vec{x}^{\,\dagger}, \tag{A.3}$$

where $\vec{x}$ is an $N \times 1$ column vector with standard complex Gaussian entries. We will see below that if the eigenvalues of $X^{(p-1)}$ are known, then the rank-one deformation (A.3) can be used to find the conditional PDF for the eigenvalues of $X^{(p)}$. Let us denote this conditional PDF by

$$Q_{p-1}^{n_0}(\{a_j\}_{j=1}^p; \{\lambda_j^{(p)}\} \,|\, \{\lambda_j^{(p-1)}\}), \qquad p = 2, 3, \dots, n. \tag{A.4}$$

It is clear that if the PDF $P_1^{n_0}(a_1; \lambda_1^{(1)})$ is known, then $P_p^{n_0}(\{a_j\}; \{\lambda_j^{(p)}\})$ can be constructed recursively using

$$P_p^{n_0}(\{a_j\}; \{\lambda_j^{(p)}\}) = \int_D \prod_k d\lambda_k^{(p-1)} \, P_{p-1}^{n_0}(\{a_j\}; \{\lambda_j^{(p-1)}\}) \, Q_{p-1}^{n_0}(\{a_j\}; \{\lambda_j^{(p)}\} \,|\, \{\lambda_j^{(p-1)}\}) \tag{A.5}$$

for $p = 1, \dots, n$ and a suitable integration domain D. Thus, our proof can be divided into three steps:

i) Use the additive rank-one deformation (A.3) to find the conditional PDF (A.4).

ii) Use the conditional PDF (A.4) together with the recursion (A.5) to show that if $P_{p-1}^{n_0}(\{a_j\}; \{\lambda_j^{(p-1)}\})$ is given by (1.4) with $n = p - 1$, then $P_p^{n_0}(\{a_j\}; \{\lambda_j^{(p)}\})$ is given by (1.4) with $n = p$.

iii) Show that $P_{p=1}^{n_0}(a_1; \lambda_1^{(1)})$ is given by (1.4) with $n = 1$.

We will look at these three steps separately below.

i) We want to find the eigenvalues of $X^{(p)}$ using the rank-one deformation (A.3) assuming that the eigenvalues of $X^{(p-1)}$ are known. The matrix $X^{(p-1)}$ has (at most) $p - 1$ non-zero eigenvalues, we assume that these eigenvalue are pairwise distinct and ordered as

$$-\infty < \lambda_1^{(p-1)} < \cdots < \lambda_{n_0}^{(p-1)} < 0 < \lambda_{n_0+1}^{(p-1)} < \cdots < \lambda_{p-1}^{(p-1)} < \infty, \tag{A.6}$$

i.e. $X^{(p-1)}$ has $p-n_0-1$ positive eigenvalues if $p > n_0$ and no positive eigenvalues if $p \leq n_0$.

If $p < N$ then the matrix $X^{(p)}$ must have an eigenvalue equal to zero with multiplicity $N-p$ (or higher). The remaining p eigenvalues will be random variables which are non-zero and have multiplicity one (almost surely), since the deformation (A.3) include a Gaussian vector x. Thus, we know from [23] that the eigenvalues of $X^{(p)}$ are given as solutions to the secular equation

$$0 = 1 - a_p\left(\frac{q_0}{\lambda} + \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \frac{q_j}{\lambda - \lambda_j^{(p-1)}}\right), \tag{A.7}$$

where each q_j is a gamma-distributed random variable given by

$$q_0 \overset{d}{=} \Gamma[N-p+1,1] \qquad \text{or} \qquad q_j \overset{d}{=} \Gamma[1,1] \qquad \text{for} \quad j = 1,\dots,p-1. \tag{A.8}$$

Furthermore, the eigenvalues of $X^{(p)}$ must be interlaced with the eigenvalues $X^{(p-1)}$, i.e. interlaced with $\{0\} \cup \{\lambda_k^{(p-1)}\}_{k=1}^{p-1}$. This interlacing may be verified by sketching the plot of the secular equation (A.7) as a function of λ. Moreover, we note that whether the interlacing starts from the left or from the right depends on whether a_p is negative or positive, or equivalently on whether $p \leq n_0$ or $p > n_0$, cf. (1.4). For $p \leq n_0$ we have the interlacing

$$-\infty < \lambda_1^{(p)} < \lambda_1^{(p-1)} < \lambda_2^{(p)} < \cdots < \lambda_{p-1}^{(p)} < \lambda_{p-1}^{(p-1)} < \lambda_p^{(p)} < 0, \tag{A.9}$$

while for $p > n_0$ we have the interlacing

$$-\infty < \lambda_1^{(p-1)} < \lambda_1^{(p)} < \cdots < \lambda_{n_0}^{(p)} < 0 < \lambda_{n_0+1}^{(p)} < \cdots < \lambda_{p-1}^{(p-1)} < \lambda_p^{(p)} < \infty. \tag{A.10}$$

Subject to these interlacings, we read off from [23, Cor. 3] that the corresponding conditional PDF (A.4) is given

$$Q_{p-1}^{n_0}(\{a_j\};\{\lambda_j^{(p)}\} \,|\, \{\lambda_k^{(p-1)}\}) = \frac{1}{|a_p|^N (N-p)!} \frac{\prod_i (\lambda_i^{(p)})^{N-p}\, e^{-\lambda_i^{(p)}/a_p}}{\prod_k (\lambda_k^{(p-1)})^{N-p+1}\, e^{-\lambda_k^{(p-1)}/a_p}} \frac{\prod_{i<j}(\lambda_j^{(p)} - \lambda_i^{(p)})}{\prod_{k<\ell}(\lambda_\ell^{(p-1)} - \lambda_k^{(p-1)})} \tag{A.11}$$

with indices $1 \leq i,j \leq p$ and $1 \leq k,\ell \leq p-1$.

ii) We can now turn to the recursive formula (A.5). The probability density (1.4) with $n = p-1$ is given by

$$P_{p-1}^{n_0}(\{a_j\};\{\lambda_j^{(p-1)}\}) = \prod_{l=1}^{p-1} \frac{1}{|a_l|} \frac{(\lambda_l^{(p-1)}/a_l)^{N-p+1}}{(N-l)!} \prod_{1\leq j<k\leq p-1} \frac{\lambda_k^{(p-1)} - \lambda_j^{(p-1)}}{a_k - a_j} \times \det\left[e^{-\lambda_i^{(p-1)}/a_j}\right]_{i,j=1}^{n_0} \det\left[e^{-\lambda_i^{(p-1)}/a_j}\right]_{i,j=n_0+1}^{p-1}. \tag{A.12}$$

Furthermore, we know from step i) that the conditional PDF is given by (A.11) and that the integration domain is given by either (A.9) or (A.10) depending on whether $p \leq n_0$ or $p > n_0$.

Consider the case $p \leq n_0$, we have the recursion

$$\int \prod_k d\lambda_k^{(p-1)}\, P_{p-1}^{n_0}(\{a_j\};\{\lambda_j^{(p-1)}\})\, Q_{p-1}^{n_0}(\{a_j\};\{\lambda_j^{(p)}\}\,|\,\{\lambda_j^{(p-1)}\}) =$$
$$a_p^{-p+1} \prod_{l=1}^{p} \frac{1}{|a_l|} \frac{(\lambda_l^{(p)}/a_l)^{N-p} e^{-\lambda_i^{(p)}/a_p}}{(N-l)!} \prod_{l=1}^{p-1} \frac{1}{a_l} \prod_{1\leq j<k\leq p-1} \frac{1}{a_k - a_j} \prod_{i<j} (\lambda_j^{(p)} - \lambda_i^{(p)})$$
$$\times \int \prod_k d\lambda_k^{(p-1)}\, \det\left[e^{-\lambda_i^{(p-1)}(1/a_j - 1/a_p)}\right]_{i,j=1}^{p-1}. \quad \text{(A.13)}$$

Let us focus on the integral on the last line. We see that

$$\int \prod_k d\lambda_k^{(p-1)}\, \det\left[e^{-\lambda_i^{(p-1)}(a_j^{-1} - a_p^{-1})}\right]_{i,j=1}^{p-1} = \det\left[\int_{\lambda_i^{(p)}}^{\lambda_{i+1}^{(p)}} e^{-x(a_j^{-1}-a_p^{-1})}\, dx\right]_{i,j=1}^{p-1}$$
$$= \det\left[\int_{\lambda_1^{(p)}}^{\lambda_{i+1}^{(p)}} e^{-x(a_j^{-1}-a_p^{-1})}\, dx\right]_{i,j=1}^{p-1} \quad \text{(A.14)}$$

with integration domain on the right-hand side on the first line given by (A.9). The first equality in (A.14) follows by pulling the integration inside the determinant, while the second equality follows by a standard row manipulation. Performing the integral within the determinant on the last line (A.14), we see that

$$\det\left[\int_{\lambda_1^{(p)}}^{\lambda_{i+1}^{(p)}} e^{-x(a_j^{-1}-a_p^{-1})}\, dx\right]_{i,j=1}^{p-1} = a_p^{p-1} \prod_{j=1}^{p-1} \frac{a_j}{a_j - a_p} \det\left[e^{-\lambda_{i+1}^{(p)}(a_j^{-1}-a_p^{-1})} - e^{-\lambda_1^{(p)}(a_j^{-1}-a_p^{-1})}\right]_{i,j=1}^{p-1}$$
$$= a_p^{p-1} \prod_{j=1}^{p-1} \frac{a_j}{a_j - a_p} \prod_{\ell=1}^{p} e^{\lambda_\ell^{(p)}/a_p} \det\left[e^{-\lambda_i^{(p)}/a_j}\right]_{i,j=1}^{p}, \quad \text{(A.15)}$$

where the last inequality can be understood by applying elementary row operations of adding multiples of the first row to the rows below so as to get zero entries in the final column, expect for the first entry, then Laplace expanding by that entry.

Finally using this evaluation of the integral from (A.13) verifies the recursion for $p \leq n_0$. The verification $p > n_0$ follows the same lines.

iii) It only remains to show that $P_{p=1}^{n_0}(a_1;\lambda_1^{(1)})$ is given by (1.4) with $n = 1$. There are two cases $n_0 = 0$ and $n_0 = 1$, but they are both trivial since we are considering scalars.

A.2 Second proof: Limit of inverse Laplace transform expression

This second proof of our main theorem starts by looking at the eigenvalues of a more general matrix

$$G^\dagger A G + B, \quad \text{(A.16)}$$

where G be an $n \times N$ complex Gaussian random matrix, while A and B are Hermitian matrices. Due to unitary invariance we can in fact choose A and B to be diagonal, say $A = \mathrm{diag}(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ and $B = \mathrm{diag}(b_1, \ldots, b_N)$, without loss of generality.

It is evident that this eigenvalue problem reduces to that of Theorem 1, when

$$b_1, \dots, b_N \to 0, \tag{A.17}$$

This observation is crucial, since it was shown by Forrester and Rains [23, Thm. 6] that (assuming the eigenvalues of A and B are pairwise distinct) the eigenvalue PDF for the matrix (A.16) can be written as

$$\mathrm{ePDF}(G^\dagger A G + B) = \frac{1}{N!} \frac{\det[x_i^{j-1}]_{i,j=1}^N}{\det[b_i^{j-1}]_{i,j=1}^N} \det\left[\mathcal{L}^{-1}[\det(\mathbb{I} + As)^{-1}](x_i - b_j)\right]_{i,j=1}^N. \tag{A.18}$$

where $\mathrm{ePDF}(M)$ is a short-hand notation for the eigenvalue density for a random matrix M and $\mathcal{L}^{-1}$ denotes the inverse two-sided Laplace transform,

$$\mathcal{L}^{-1}[f(s)](x) := \lim_{\tau \to 0} \int_{-i\infty}^{+i\infty} \frac{ds}{2\pi i}\, e^{sx + \tau s^2/2} f(s). \tag{A.19}$$

In some sense, this result is more general than the one we are trying to prove, but it is also far less explicit and therefore less useful for our purposes. Thus, the strategy to prove Theorem 1 presented in this subsection is to show that given (1.3) then (A.18) reduces to (1.4) in the limit (A.17). Here (1.4) refers to the PDF with the N non-zero eigenvalues. However, we know from Remark 15 that the $n = N$ case of (1.4) implies the general n case. It is therefore sufficient for us to set $n = N$ in (A.18) and to show that in the limit (A.17) the case $n = N$ of (1.4) appears.

For this purpose, we begin by noting that with $f(s) = \det(\mathbb{I} + As)^{-1}$, the limit $\tau \to 0$ in (A.19) can be taken inside the integral, telling us that

$$\mathcal{L}^{-1}[\det(\mathbb{I} + As)^{-1}](x_i - b_j) = \int_{-i\infty}^{+i\infty} \frac{ds}{2\pi i} \frac{e^{s(x_i - b_j)}}{\det(\mathbb{I} + As)}. \tag{A.20}$$

After substituting this into the last determinant in (A.18), the limit (A.17) may be found by successive use of L'Hôpital's rule. This yields

$$\mathrm{ePDF}(G^\dagger A G) = \prod_{k=0}^N \frac{1}{k!} \det[x_i^{j-1}]_{i,j=1}^N \det\left[\int_{-i\infty}^{+i\infty} \frac{ds}{2\pi i} \frac{(-s)^{j-1} e^{sx_i}}{\prod_{k=1}^N (1 + a_k s)}\right]_{i,j=1}^N, \tag{A.21}$$

hence the only remaining task is to evaluate the contour integral within the latter determinant and then to compare the resulting eigenvalue PDF with that of the theorem.

Our evaluation of the contour integral follows the standard procedure of first closing the contour and then using the residue theorem. Due to the inequalities (1.5), we see that the contour must be closed in the positive half-plane for $i = 1, \dots, n_0$, which according to the inequalities (1.4) picks up contributions from n_0 simple poles located at $-1/a_1, \dots, -1/a_{n_0}$. Thus, for $i = 1, \dots, n_0$ the contour integral equals

$$-\sum_{k=1}^{n_0} \frac{a_k^{-j} e^{-x_i/a_k}}{\prod_{l=1,\, l\neq k}^N (1 - a_l/a_k)} = \sum_{k=1}^{n_0} \frac{1}{|a_k|} \frac{a_k^{N-j} e^{-x_i/a_k}}{\prod_{l=1,\, l\neq k}^N (a_k - a_l)}. \tag{A.22}$$

For $i = n_0 + 1, \dots, N$ the contour must be closed in the negative half-plane picking up contributions from the remaining $N - n_0$ poles located at $-1/a_{n_0+1}, \dots, -1/a_N$, which implies that these integrals yield

$$\sum_{k=n_0+1}^{N} \frac{a_k^{-j} e^{-x_i/a_k}}{\prod_{l=1,\, l\neq k}^N (1 - a_l/a_k)} = \sum_{k=n_0+1}^{N} \frac{1}{|a_k|} \frac{a_k^{N-j} e^{-x_i/a_k}}{\prod_{l=1,\, l\neq k}^N (a_k - a_l)}. \tag{A.23}$$

We see that the main difference between (A.22) and (A.23) is the number of terms in the sum.

Now, substituting (A.22) and (A.23) into the PDF (A.21) shows that

$$\mathrm{ePDF}(G^\dagger AG) = \prod_{k=0}^{N} \frac{1}{k!} \det[x_i^{j-1}]_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{\substack{1\le k_1,\dots,k_{n_0}\le n_0 \\ n_0+1\le k_{n_0+1},\dots,k_N\le N}} \det\left[\frac{1}{|a_{k_i}|}\frac{a_{k_i}^{N-j}e^{-x_i/a_{k_i}}}{\prod_{l=1,\,l\neq k}^N (a_{k_i}-a_l)}\right]_{i,j=1}^N. \tag{A.24}$$

The latter determinant in this expression may be simplified considerably by noting that the only factor inside determinant which depends on both index i (through k_i) and index j is $a_{k_i}^{N-j}$, while only factor depending on both index i and index k_i is $e^{-x_i/a_{k_i}}$. Thus, upon expansion and reordering of products we see that

$$\det\left[\frac{1}{|a_{k_i}|}\frac{a_{k_i}^{N-j}e^{-x_i/a_{k_i}}}{\prod_{l=1,\,l\neq k}^N (a_{k_i}-a_l)}\right]_{i,j=1}^N = \prod_{i=1}^N \frac{e^{-x_i/a_{k_i}}}{|a_i|} \prod_{1\le i<j\le N}\frac{1}{(a_j-a_i)^2} \det\left[a_{k_i}^{j-1}\right]_{i,j=1}^N. \tag{A.25}$$

Thus, the eigenvalue PDF becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{ePDF}(G^\dagger AG) = \prod_{k=0}^{N} \frac{1}{k!} \det[x_i^{j-1}]_{i,j=1}^N \prod_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{|a_i|} \prod_{1\le i<j\le N}\frac{1}{(a_j-a_i)^2} \\ \times \sum_{\substack{1\le k_1,\dots,k_{n_0}\le n_0 \\ n_0+1\le k_{n_0+1},\dots,k_N\le N}} \prod_{i=1}^N e^{-x_i/a_{k_i}} \det\left[a_{k_i}^{j-1}\right]_{i,j=1}^N.\end{aligned} \tag{A.26}$$

In order to evaluate the sums on the second line in (A.26), we note that the indices satisfy $k_1,\dots,k_{n_0} < k_{n_0+1},\dots,k_N$ and that the determinant is anti-symmetric in both $\{k_1,\dots,k_{n_0}\}$ and $\{k_{n_0+1},\dots,k_N\}$. This allow us to write

$$\sum_{\substack{1\le k_1,\dots,k_{n_0}\le n_0 \\ n_0+1\le k_{n_0+1},\dots,k_N\le N}} \prod_{i=1}^N e^{-x_i/a_{k_i}} \det\left[a_{k_i}^{j-1}\right]_{i,j=1}^N = \det\left[a_i^{j-1}\right]_{i,j=1}^N \det[e^{-x_i/a_j}]_{i,j=1}^{n_0} \det[e^{-x_i/a_j}]_{i,j=n_0+1}^N. \tag{A.27}$$

The first determinant on the right-hand side in (A.27) and the first determinant in (A.26) are both Vandermonde determinants, so the eigenvalue PDF (A.26) becomes

$$\mathrm{ePDF}(G^\dagger AG) = \prod_{k=0}^{N} \frac{1}{k!} \prod_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{|a_i|} \prod_{1\le i<j\le N}\frac{x_j-x_i}{a_j-a_i} \det[e^{-x_i/a_j}]_{i,j=1}^{n_0} \det[e^{-x_i/a_j}]_{i,j=n_0+1}^N, \tag{A.28}$$

which we recognise as the desired statement (1.3) with $n = N$.

A.3 Third proof: Matrix integral over the pseudo-unitary group

For this third proof of Theorem 1 we will again restrict our attention to the case $n = N$. The Gaussian matrix G specified in Theorem 1 has distribution

$$\left(\frac{1}{\pi}\right)^{N^2} e^{-\operatorname{Tr} G^\dagger G}(dG), \tag{A.29}$$

where (dG) is the Lebesgue measure on the space of complex $N \times N$ matrices. It is a standard result from random matrix theory that the positive semi-definite Hermitian matrix $\tilde{W} = GG^\dagger$ is distributed according to

$$\prod_{k=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{\pi^k k!} e^{-\operatorname{Tr} \tilde{W}} (d\tilde{W})_{>0}, \tag{A.30}$$

where $(d\tilde{W})$ is the Lebesgue measure on the space of Hermitian matrices subject to the constraint that $\tilde{W}$ is positive semi-definite. This may be seen by decomposing the matrix G using a polar decomposition, i.e. $G = U\tilde{W}^{1/2}$ with U unitary. Making this change of variables and integrating over the unitary degrees of freedom contribute an extra factor, $2^{-N} \operatorname{vol} U(N)$, to the normalisation; see e.g. [17].

The proof presented in this section is based on an integration formula for the pseudo-unitary group with a pseudo-metric tensor η determined according to the number positive (negative) eigenvalues of the matrix A. More precisely, with A as specified in Theorem 1, we define

$$A_+ = \operatorname{diag}(|a_1|, \ldots, |a_N|) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \eta = \eta_{n_0}^N = \operatorname{diag}(\underbrace{-1, \ldots, -1}_{n_0}, \underbrace{+1, \ldots, +1}_{N-n_0}), \tag{A.31}$$

such that $A = A_+\eta = \eta A_+$. In fact, we have the more general relation $A = A_+^p \eta A_+^q$ with $p+q = 1$, since the matrix A is assumed to be non-singular.

Next, introduce the matrix $Z = A_+^{1/2} \tilde{W} A_+^{1/2}$ where $\tilde{W}$ is an $N \times N$ matrix distributed according to (A.30). Since both Z and $\tilde{W}$ are complex Hermitian random matrices, we have $(dZ) = (\det A_+)^N (d\tilde{W})$, see e.g. [17, Eq. (1.35)]. Thus, using that A_+ is invertible we know from (A.30) that the distribution of Z is equal to

$$\prod_{k=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{\pi^k k!} \frac{e^{-\operatorname{Tr} A_+^{-1} Z}}{(\det A_+)^N} (dZ). \tag{A.32}$$

In terms of Z we may define $\tilde{Z} = \eta Z = \eta A_+^{1/2} G G^\dagger A_+^{1/2}$. This matrix is important, since its eigenvalues are identical to those of

$$G^\dagger A_+^{1/2} \eta A_+^{1/2} G = G^\dagger A G. \tag{A.33}$$

Here, the right-hand side is the matrix of interest for Theorem 1 and the equality is a simple consequence of the definition (A.31). Moreover, since $(d\tilde{Z}) = (dZ)$ (the action of η on Z is only to change the sign of some of the entries of Z), we read off from (A.32) that the distribution of $\tilde{Z}$ is equal to

$$\prod_{k=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{\pi^k k!} \frac{e^{-\operatorname{Tr} A^{-1} \tilde{Z}}}{(\det A_+)^N} (d\tilde{Z}), \tag{A.34}$$

where it is further required that $\eta\tilde{Z}$ is positive semi-definite.

It is a known result that if Z is a positive definite matrix, then the matrix ηZ has exactly n_0 negative eigenvalues and $N - n_0$ positive eigenvalues [46]. Furthermore, the matrix $\tilde{Z}$ can be diagonalised using a pseudo-unitary similarity transformation, i.e. there exists a matrix $V \in U(\eta)$ such that

$$\tilde{Z} = VLV^{-1}, \tag{A.35}$$

where $L = \operatorname{diag}(x_1, \ldots, x_N)$ is a real diagonal matrix. We recall that the pseudo-unitary group is defined as

$$U(\eta) = \{V \in GL(N, \mathbb{C}) \,|\, V^\dagger \eta V = V \eta V^\dagger = \eta\}.$$

The Jacobian associated to the change of variables (A.35) is [46]

$$(d\tilde{Z}) = (V^{-1}dV) \prod_{1\leq i<j\leq N} (x_j - x_i)^2 \prod_{l=1}^{N} dx_l. \tag{A.36}$$

For the measures (A.36) to be in one-to-one correspondence, it is necessary to restrict the overall phase of each eigenvector, or equivalently require that $V \in U(\eta)/U(1)^N$. We note that $(V^{-1}dV)$ is the Haar measure on the pseudo-unitary group.

Substituting (A.36) into (A.34) shows that the eigenvalue PDF of $\tilde{Z}$ (or equivalently of $G^\dagger AG$) is equal to

$$P_{n_0,n}(\{a_j\}_{j=1}^N; \{x_j\}_{j=1}^N) = \prod_{k=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{\pi^k k!} \prod_{1\leq i<j\leq N} (x_j - x_i)^2 \int e^{-\operatorname{Tr} A^{-1}VLV^{-1}} \frac{(V^{-1}dV)}{\det(A_+)^N}, \tag{A.37}$$

where matrix integral is over the pseudo-unitary group $U(\eta)/U(1)^N$.

For $n_0 = 0$ and $n_0 = N$, the signature η becomes proportional to the identity and the group integral in (A.37) reduces to the well-known Harish-Chandra–Itzykson–Zuber integral [27, 30]. The generalisation of the Harish-Chandra–Itzykson–Zuber integral from an integral over the unitary group to an integral over the pseudo-unitary group (i.e. $0 < n_0 < N$) has been studied by Fyodorov [25, 26], who showed that

$$\int_{U(\eta)/U(1)^N} e^{-\operatorname{Tr} AVBV^{-1}} (V^{-1}dV) = K_{N,n_0} \frac{\det[e^{-a_i b_j}]_{i,j=1}^{n_0} \det[e^{-a_{i+n_0} b_{j+n_0}}]_{i,j=1}^{N-n_0}}{\prod_{1\leq i<j\leq N}(a_j - a_i)(b_j - b_i)} \tag{A.38}$$

with K_{N,n_0} denoting an undetermined proportionality constant, and $A = \operatorname{diag}(a_1, \ldots, a_N)$ and $B = \operatorname{diag}(b_1, \ldots, b_N)$ denoting diagonal matrices subject to the constraints

$$\begin{aligned} &a_1 < \cdots < a_{n_0} < 0 < a_{n_0+1} < \cdots < a_N, \\ &b_1 < \cdots < b_{n_0} < 0 < b_{n_0+1} < \cdots < b_N. \end{aligned} \tag{A.39}$$

The constraints (A.39) must be included to ensure convergence of the group integral on the right-hand side in (A.38) for an $0 < n_0 < N$. This is necessary since the pseudo-unitary group is non-compact except for $n_0 = 0$ or $n_0 = N$ in which case the aforementioned constraints may be ignored.

Now, using the integration formula (A.38) to evaluate the group integral in (A.37), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{n_0,n}(\{a_j\}_{j=1}^N; \{x_j\}_{j=1}^N) = K_{N,n_0} \prod_{k=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{\pi^k k!\,|a_{k+1}|} \prod_{1\leq i<j\leq N} \frac{x_j - x_i}{a_j - a_i} \\ \times \det[e^{-x_i/a_j}]_{i,j=1}^{n_0} \det[e^{-x_{i+n_0}/a_{j+n_0}}]_{i,j=1}^{N-n_0}, \end{aligned} \tag{A.40}$$

which agrees with the $n = N$ case of (1.4) provided that $K_{N,n_0} = \pi^{N(N-1)/2}$. We note that the proportionality constant is independent of n_0. Moreover, the cases $n_0 = 0$ and $n_0 = N$ (where the group integral is over $U(N)/U(1)^N$) are consistent with the known proportionality constant from the Harish-Chandra–Itzykson–Zuber integral.

References

[1] G. Akemann, J. Baik, and P. Di Francesco (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of random matrix theory.* Oxford University Press, 2011.

[2] G. Akemann, and J. R. Ipsen, *Recent exact and asymptotic results for products of independent random matrices.* Acta Physica Polonica B 46.9 (2015).

[3] G. Akemann, J. R. Ipsen, and M. Kieburg, *Products of rectangular random matrices: singular values and progressive scattering.* Phys. Rev. E **88** (2013) 052118.

[4] G. Akemann, M. Kieburg, and L. Wei, *Singular value correlation functions for products of Wishart random matrices.* J. Phys. A **46** (2013) 275205.

[5] N. Alexeev, F. Götze, and A. Tikhomirov, *Asymptotic distribution of singular values of powers of random matrices.* Lith. Math. J. 50 (2010) 121.

[6] C. Andréief, *Note sur une relation les intégrales définies des produits des fonctions.* Mém. de la Soc. Sci. Bordeaux 2 (1883).

[7] Z. D. Bai, B. Miao, and B. Jin, On limit theorem for the eigenvalues of product of two random matrices. J. Mult. Anal. 98 (2007) 76.

[8] T. Banica, S. T. Belinschi, M. Capitaine, and B. Collins, *Free Bessel laws.* Canad. J. Math, **63** (2011) 3.

[9] A. Borodin, *Biorthogonal ensembles.* Nucl. Phys. B **536** (1998) 704.

[10] N. G. de Bruijn, *On some multiple integrals involving determinants.* J. Indian Math. Soc 19 (1955) 133.

[11] Z. Burda, A. Jarosz, G. Livan, M. A. Nowak, and A. Swiech, *Eigenvalues and singular values of products of rectangular Gaussian random matrices.* Phys. Rev. E **82** (2010) 061114.

[12] L. Carlitz, *A note on certain biorthogonal polynomials.* Pacific J. Math. 24 (1968) 425.

[13] T. Claeys, A. B. J. Kuijlaars, and D. Wang, *Correlation kernels for sums and products of random matrices.* Random Matrices: Theory Appl. 4 (2015) 1550017.

[14] T. Claeys, and S. Romano, *Biorthogonal ensembles with two-particle interactions.* Nonlinearity 27 (2014) 2419.

[15] A. R. Collar, *On the reciprocation of certain matrices.* Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh. 59 (1939) 195.

[16] J. L. Fields, *The asymptotic expansion of the Meijer G-function.* Math. Comp. (1972) 757.

[17] P. J. Forrester, *Log-gases and random matrices.* Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2010.

[18] P. J. Forrester, *Eigenvalue statistics for for product complex Wishart matrices.* J. Phys. A 47 (2014) 345202.

[19] P. J. Forrester, and J. R. Ipsen, *Selberg integral theory and Muttalib–Borodin ensembles.* arXiv:1612.06517.

[20] P. J. Forrester, and D.-Z. Liu, *Raney distributions and random matrix theory.* J. Stat. Phys. 158 (2015) 1051.

[21] P. J. Forrester, and D.-Z. Liu, *Singular values for products of complex Ginibre matrices with a source: hard edge limit and phase transition.* Commun. Math. Phys. **344** (2016), 333.

[22] P. J. Forrester, D.-Z. Liu, and P. Zinn-Justin, *Equilibrium problems for Raney densities.* Nonlinearity **28** (2015) 2265.

[23] P. J. Forrester, and E. M. Rains, *Interpretations of some parameter dependent generalizations of classical matrix ensembles.* Probab. Theory Relat. Fields **131** (2005) 1.

[24] P. J. Forrester, and D. Wang, *Muttalib–Borodin ensembles in random matrix theory—realisations and correlation functions.* arXiv:1502.07147 (2015).

[25] Y. V. Fyodorov, *Negative moments of characteristic polynomials of random matrices: Ingham–*

Siegel integral as an alternative to Hubbard–Stratonovich transformation. Nucl. Phys. B 621 (2002) 643.
[26] Y. V. Fyodorov, and E. Strahov, *Characteristic polynomials of random Hermitian matrices and Duistermaat–Heckman localisation on non-compact Kähler manifolds.* Nucl. Phys. B 630 (2002) 453.
[27] Harish-Chandra, *Differential operators on a semisimple Lie algebra.* Amer. J. Math. (1957) 87.
[28] J. R. Ipsen, *Products of independent Gaussian random matrices.* PhD thesis, Bielefeld University 2015 (arXiv:1510.06128)
[29] J. R. Ipsen, and M. Kieburg, *Weak commutation relations and eigenvalue statistics for products of rectangular random matrices.* Phys. Rev. E 89 (2014) 032106.
[30] C. Itzykson, and J.-B. Zuber, *The planar approximation. II.* J. Math. Phys. 21 (1980) 411.
[31] M. Kieburg, and H. Kösters, *Exact Relation between Singular Value and Eigenvalue Statistics.* Random Matrices: Theor. Appl. **5** (2016) 1650015.
[32] M. Kieburg, A. B. J. Kuijlaars, and D. Stivigny, *Singular value statistics of matrix products with truncated unitary matrices.* Int. Math. Res. Not. (2016) 3392.
[33] J. D. E. Konhauser, *Biorthogonal polynomials suggested by the Laguerre polynomials.* Pacific J. Math. 21 (1967) 303.
[34] A. B. J. Kuijlaars, *Transformations of polynomial ensembles.* In "*Modern Trends in Constructive Function Theory*" Amer. Math. Soc. (2016) 253.
[35] A. B. J. Kuijlaars and P. Roman, *Spherical functions approach to sums of random Hermitian matrices.* arXiv:1611.08932.
[36] A. B. J. Kuijlaars, and D. Stivigny, *Singular values of products of random matrices and polynomial ensembles.* Random Matrices: Theor. Appl. **3** (2014) 1450011.
[37] A. B. J. Kuijlaars, and L. Zhang, *Singular values of products of Ginibre random matrices, multiple orthogonal polynomials and hard edge scaling limits.* Commun. Math. Phys. **332** (2014) 759.
[38] S. Kumar, *Random matrix ensembles involving Gaussian Wigner and Wishart matrices, and biorthogonal structure.* Phys. Rev. E **92** (2015) 032903.
[39] D.-Z. Liu, D. Wang, and L. Zhang, *Bulk and soft-edge universality for singular values of products of Ginibre random matrices.* Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Stat. **52** (2016) 1734.
[40] A. M. Mathai, R. K. Saxena, and H. J. Haubold *The H-function: theory and applications.* Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.
[41] R. R. Müller, *On the asymptotic eigenvalue distribution of concatenated vector-valued fading channels.* IEEE Trans. Inf. Theor. **48** (2002) 2086.
[42] K. A. Muttalib, *Random matrix models with additional interactions.* J. Phys. A **28** (1995) L159.
[43] A. Nica, and R. Speicher, *Lectures on the combinatorics of free probability.* Cambridge University Press, 2006.
[44] L. A. Pastur, and M. Shcherbina, *Eigenvalue distribution of large random matrices.* Amer. Math. Soc., 2011.
[45] K. A. Penson, and K. Zyczkowski, *Product of Ginibre matrices: Fuss–Catalan and Raney distributions.* Phys. Rev. E **83** (2011) 061118.
[46] A. M. M. Pruisken, and Schäfer, *The Anderson model for electron localisation non-linear sigma model, asymptotic gauge invariance.* Nucl. Phys. B 200 (1982) 22.
[47] B. Simon, *The Christoffel–Darboux kernel.* Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. 79 (2008) 295.
[48] E. Wigner, *Statistical Properties of real symmetric matrices with many dimensions.* Can.

Math. Congr. Proc., University of Toronto Press (1957) 174.
[49] L. Zhang, *Local universality in biorthogonal Laguerre ensembles.* J. Stat. Phys. **161** (2015) 688.